

familiar and everyday language? Whatever the answer, if there is still a living Christian Latin, it is that of the liturgy: the mother tongue which in its prayers and hymns cradled our infancy in the faith, a living language, not in the ordinary and material sense that it produces new works and creates new words, but spiritually, in our hearts, able more than any other Latin to move the spirits of those who hear it." (p. 143) Also, Professor Blaise is complaining that the knowledge and study of Christian Latin is lessening, and he vividly urges that it must be intensified, especially by the Roman Catholic clergy. It is much more important for them, he suggests, even to devote less time and energy to classical Latin and much more to Christian Latin so that they may perform their mission better.

Professor Blaise's study is, in parts, very detailed concerning Latin vocabulary and style, but also shows, almost in every page, among other things, the great influence that Greek has exerted on the formation of Christian Latin. In this concern one may justly say that this kind of detailed philological research is a major *desideratum* for the Greek Christian language also, not only the *Koinē*, but the liturgical Greek as well. Of course, extensive work has already been done, but for the New Testament Greek only and mostly by foreign scholars. Yet, this is a work most appropriate for Greek Orthodox scholars, for many and evident reasons. And this study of the Greek Christian language should be widened and deepened so that it may embrace even specific themes, such as the history of words, metaphors, symbolic expressions, stylistic forms, and the standardization or the evolution of their meaning and use in the long life of the Greek Christian language. Such an extensive and detailed study will help for a better understanding not simply of the text but first of all of the living spirit of the Scriptures and of the other sacred literature.

COSTAS M. PROUSSIS

YVES CONGAR, O. P., *After Nine Hundred Years: The Background of the Schism Between the Eastern and Western Churches*. New York: Fordham University Press, 1959. Pp. ix, 150. \$4.50.

The announcement by Pope John XXIII on January 25, 1959, of the impending Ecumenical Council which would be "an invitation to the separated Christian Communities to find unity," prompted the Russian Center of Fordham University under Father Paul Malleux, S. J.,

to issue an English translation of Father Congar's 'Neuf cents ans après,' originally published in Belgium in 1954 as part of the 1054-1954 anniversary, as "L'Église et les Églises," but with more helpful material and an up-to-date bibliography and copious notes. To those in the Roman Catholic Church who are working diligently and praying for a rapprochement of the two ancient and historical Churches, this work seemed "an excellent preparation."

The author is no neophyte to the subject, having written a number of books and articles on the relations of the East and West from the earliest days of Christianity. He reminds the reader from the outset that his study is "in the realm of basic research," and he may even be reproached for "schismatization." In order, however, to avoid such difficulty, he states clearly and emphatically that he is merely listing "the various aspects, causes or manifestations of the global and continuous fact of this estrangement." The causes of the separation, political, cultural and ecclesiological, have been treated by other scholars, too, but Congar gives a fuller treatment to the last factor, the ecclesiological. To him, and possibly to others of his Church, the East appears to have been interested throughout the centuries in local Churches with a disregard of the "jurisdictional implications of the Church as a society centered, as it was, upon the mystical and sacramental aspects of ecclesiastical life." The East never realized, in other words, the ecclesiology of the Universal Church that was held by the Church of Rome. It fell, therefore, into schism because it was separated from the source of unity, Rome, which exercised with its primacy "the role of moderator of the Universal Church, of guide in her life, of criterion of her unity." (p. 82)

Congar's argument is that the schism between the two Churches is not yet complete but that it can become so if they continue to ignore each other much longer. He offers a solution: reciprocal recognition. Each Church is to accept the other with its traditional rights. The Roman Church, on the one hand, is to recognize the Orthodox with its rites and discipline as an autocephalous entity, not in any way "an absorption in the odious sense of the word," and the Orthodox, on the other, is to recognize the primacy of Rome as was the case throughout the early centuries, without causing a schism. However, the "appeals to Rome" presuppose nothing other than the position of the "prima sedes," of which there was never any question. Father Congar admits that the writings of the greatest Fathers of the Church in the East recognized the primacy of the Apostle Peter, and the Roman See as "prima sedes" but provide no theological statement on the universal primacy of Rome by divine right. (p. 62) It is regrettable that so

fundamental an issue was not settled by a full discussion in one of the great Ecumenical Synods while there was still union. Some Roman Catholic writers, remarks the author, find three zones in which the papal power was exercised: (1) the zone around the city of Rome that was subject immediately to Rome; (2) the zone of the West outside Italy; and (3) a zone of universal extension "concretely representing the East where Rome only intervened, but with authority, as arbiter of the whole communion and as judge in *causes majores*." (p. 63) When the Bishop of Rome wrote to the East his tone was different from that employed in addressing the West. In the former case, he spoke as an associate; in the latter, as to a subordinate. The centralizing movement began with Nicholas I, who understood the primacy as "plenitudo potestatis." He wished to impose upon Constantinople his wish of authority directly and definitely. The East refused to accept it because it was believed that the Church was governed by the Pentarchy of the Patriarchs and by the Councils. In the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, the Orthodox continue to criticize "the absolutism, centralization and fiscal policies of the Roman Curia to which the necessary and grandiose reform of Gregory VII was, so to say, the preface." (p. 73)

This work contains the fruits of much research and study. The notes and bibliography in many languages are extensive. It abounds in phrases and theses, some meant to be challenging, others not. There are many generalities which can be misleading and some doubtful history. It is written in an irenic spirit, but the author does not lose sight of the fact that in the end the East must realize its mistakes and return to the Apostolic See. There is no other way for ending the schism. With one breath he speaks of union between two former associates and in the other of reunion between local Churches with the head of unity, Rome. In one sweeping statement he states that the Orthodox is to remain an autocephalous Church, and in another he talks of submission. Thus, he does not produce any change in the policy of Rome and this is to be regretted. His Holiness, the Ecumenical Patriarch, Athenagoras I, has so prudently stated the Orthodox position: unity between the two Churches must be "in the spirit of equality, justice, spiritual freedom and mutual respect." Since doctrinal union cannot be attained at this time, the Ecumenical Patriarch has proposed unity in practical matters, but always in "the spirit of equality."

REV. GEORGE J. TSOUMAS



Copyright and Use:

As an ATLAS user, you may print, download, or send articles for individual use according to fair use as defined by U.S. and international copyright law and as otherwise authorized under your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement.

No content may be copied or emailed to multiple sites or publicly posted without the copyright holder(s)' express written permission. Any use, decompiling, reproduction, or distribution of this journal in excess of fair use provisions may be a violation of copyright law.

This journal is made available to you through the ATLAS collection with permission from the copyright holder(s). The copyright holder for an entire issue of a journal typically is the journal owner, who also may own the copyright in each article. However, for certain articles, the author of the article may maintain the copyright in the article. Please contact the copyright holder(s) to request permission to use an article or specific work for any use not covered by the fair use provisions of the copyright laws or covered by your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement. For information regarding the copyright holder(s), please refer to the copyright information in the journal, if available, or contact ATLA to request contact information for the copyright holder(s).

About ATLAS:

The ATLA Serials (ATLAS®) collection contains electronic versions of previously published religion and theology journals reproduced with permission. The ATLAS collection is owned and managed by the American Theological Library Association (ATLA) and received initial funding from Lilly Endowment Inc.

The design and final form of this electronic document is the property of the American Theological Library Association.

Once the prayer invoking the Holy Spirit to descend upon the ordinand has been recited, the Bishop offers to the ordained Deacon his right hand of fellowship inviting him to assist henceforth in the administering of the Sacraments. To the ordained Priest, the Bishop in addition to his offering the right hand of fellowship, presents the ordained Priest with a Bible commanding him to preach the Word of God and to administer the Sacraments. To the newly-ordained Bishop, the Consecrator presents a Pastoral Staff and exhorts him to hold up the weak, to heal the sick, to bind up the broken and to seek the lost.

THE REV. CHRISTODOULOS KALLOS

PAUL BLANSHARD, *American Freedom and Catholic Power*. Second edition, revised and enlarged. Boston: Beacon Press, 1958. Pp. 402. \$3.95.

The initial appearance of Paul Blanshard's book, *American Freedom and Catholic Power* on April 19, 1949, stirred up immediate controversy. There can be no doubt that this second revised and enlarged edition, which attempts to bring up to date what Blanshard originally stated almost ten years ago, will still arouse considerable interest and, to be sure, spirited attacks. Blanshard's principal thesis remains the same: "When a church enters the arena of controversial social policy and attempts to control the judgment of its own people (and of other people) on foreign affairs, social hygiene, public education, and modern science, it must be reckoned with as an organ of political and cultural power. . . . It is not primarily a religious problem: it is an institutional and political problem."

In thirteen very provocative chapters, Blanshard goes right to work to prove his argument, using copious quotations from Catholic sources themselves to indicate the clear-cut policy of the Roman Catholic hierarchy in the United States. Blanshard always clearly differentiates between the American Catholic people and the Roman hierarchy. His object is to point out what he believes to be the incompatibility of American freedom with the theoretical claims of authoritarian Roman Catholic power if they were ever realized completely, and the danger to every non-Catholic if the Roman hierarchy ever achieves the power that it claims it rightfully deserves in this country.

It seems that Blanshard's attacks, though presented as objectively as such attacks can possibly be presented, nevertheless miss a number of essential points, which may very well be the greatest weaknesses of the book. Blanshard fails to acknowledge the real possibility that religion, as the Roman Catholic Church teaches it, involves one's total being, physical as well as spiritual, not being merely concerned with a departmentalized portion of an individual's life, which we may call "religious."

Blanshard's idea of religion is obviously opposed to Catholicism's so that there should inevitably be a difference of views.

Blanshard talks often of what may be described as a "democracy of doctrine." This is a characteristic of democratic Protestantism. But what Church which claims exclusiveness of divine authority, which claims that it is *the* Church of Christ could possibly accept an elective deposit of Faith that is changeable with each new age and subject to the whims of each new assembly? Certainly the Orthodox Church would not accept such a "democracy of doctrine" from its lay members.

It would seem that the Orthodox Church in fact alone combines a democracy of administration with an authoritative body of doctrine of the true Church of Christ that would produce the balance between authority and freedom that Blanshard is perhaps unconsciously looking for. Yet only once does he mention the Greek Orthodox and then only in connection with mixed marriages.

This is a book that should excite the attention of every American who wishes to see that his religious liberties remain undisturbed.

JOHN E. REXINE

MARCUS BACH, *Major Religions of the World*. New York and Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1959. Pp. 128. \$1.00.

This compact little book forms a very handy introduction to the major religions of the world. Hinduism, Zoroastrianism, Buddhism, Judaism, Confucianism and Taoism, Shinto, Islam, and Christianity are the major religions discussed and each is dealt with in a single chapter. Preceding each chapter is a useful glossary of terms peculiar to the religion which is described in the chapter. There is a final chapter entitled "Your Religion and You," which seeks to explain to the reader why he has been taken on this journey through various religions.



Copyright and Use:

As an ATLAS user, you may print, download, or send articles for individual use according to fair use as defined by U.S. and international copyright law and as otherwise authorized under your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement.

No content may be copied or emailed to multiple sites or publicly posted without the copyright holder(s)' express written permission. Any use, decompiling, reproduction, or distribution of this journal in excess of fair use provisions may be a violation of copyright law.

This journal is made available to you through the ATLAS collection with permission from the copyright holder(s). The copyright holder for an entire issue of a journal typically is the journal owner, who also may own the copyright in each article. However, for certain articles, the author of the article may maintain the copyright in the article. Please contact the copyright holder(s) to request permission to use an article or specific work for any use not covered by the fair use provisions of the copyright laws or covered by your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement. For information regarding the copyright holder(s), please refer to the copyright information in the journal, if available, or contact ATLA to request contact information for the copyright holder(s).

About ATLAS:

The ATLA Serials (ATLAS®) collection contains electronic versions of previously published religion and theology journals reproduced with permission. The ATLAS collection is owned and managed by the American Theological Library Association (ATLA) and received initial funding from Lilly Endowment Inc.

The design and final form of this electronic document is the property of the American Theological Library Association.

Orthodox brethren of several national jurisdictions and through the financial support of the Federated Russian Orthodox Clubs and the Russian Theological Fund.

The manual is conveniently and usefully divided into two main sections: "What a Teacher Must Know" and "How to Teach." It is thus valuable as a guide to the content of instruction as well as a guide to methods of classroom instruction.

The Rev. Stephan Sedov writes the Introduction, explaining to the teacher how to use the manual (pp. 3-7). Rev. Alexis Kniaseff gives a very useful "Introduction to the Study of the Old Testament" (pp. 7-17), while Dr. Vaselin Kesich does a similar job in his "The New Testament; Outline for the Study of the Life of Christ" (pp. 18-43). Rev. Eusebius A. Stephanou writes a very valuable and concise "Outline of Dogmatic Theology" (pp. 44-65) and the Very Rev. Alexander Schmemann gives us a fairly detailed and penetrating survey of liturgical theology in his chapter "The Orthodox Worship" (pp. 65-102). Rev. Constantine Volaitis gives us a very brief and really inadequate descriptive bibliography of the "History of the Orthodox Church" (pp. 103-108). In the case of this article, the reader is urged to consult Rev. Dean Timothy Andrews' *The Eastern Orthodox Church: A Bibliography* (New York: Greek Archdiocese Publication Department, 1957, pp. 79), which will be of much more practical use.

The section on "How to Teach" (pp. 108-130) breaks down into four study group outlines: (1) "The Pre-School Child"; (2) "The Young Primary Child"; (3) "The Junior Child"; (4) "The Early Teen Agers"; and into "Teaching by Telling"; "Teaching by Showing"; "Teaching by Doing"; "Teaching by Group Planning and Action"; "Teaching by Group Thinking"; and "Introducing Our Children to Life in the Church." The material, though unsigned, has been compiled by the Executive Secretary of the Orthodox Christian Education Commission, Mrs. Sophie Koulomzin.

This excellent Orthodox Teacher's Manual should be in the hands of every Orthodox Sunday School Teacher, no matter what his national jurisdiction or previous preparation. With the proper guidance of the individual pastor, this manual can go a long way in helping improve our Orthodox Sunday School and Church School situations

JOHN E. REXINE

CONSTANTINE CAVARNOS, *Anchored in God*. Athens: Astir Publishing Company, 1959. Pp. 230. Illustrated. \$3.00.

The monastic community of Mount Athos — or the Holy Mountain, as Athos is universally known among the Orthodox — is the theme of this beautifully illustrated and well written book.

Dr. Cavarnos, whose varied interests in philosophy, religion, aesthetics and Byzantine hagiography in particular have characterized his professional work, was admirably equipped to attempt an assessment of the life, art and thought prevailing on Athos today. Three journeys to Athos and intimate contact with monks — both those living within one of the 20 sovereign monasteries and those attached to one of the latter's dependencies, a skete, or a kelli — afforded him ample opportunity to observe monastic life as it is lived at present on the Mountain. More important, the close intimacy that he succeeded in establishing with many of those who had retreated from "the world" enabled him to delve into the fundamental question of why a person should choose to withdraw from the world in the first place.

The title of the book summarizes the answers given to the author to that last question. A strong sense of sin, the impermanence and hence insignificance of temporal life, a strong desire for salvation and a happy, eternal after-life — all these the author was told repeatedly were dominant motives that sent such men to seek union with God here and now. Their whole life, as the author describes it, seems to be attuned to such a pursuit. Even the most trivial activity in the monk's daily life bears the mark of the terrific force that such a unity of purpose exerts upon it.

Life on Athos remains simple, in a material sense (even though the tractor has made an appearance in one of the monasteries (and electricity in three — though the latter in name only since the generators keep breaking down) and intensely spiritual. Humility and self-abnegation still characterize the individual monk; also the love of God which he so intensely seeks. Significantly, the last he expands to embrace the whole of mankind, cultivating thus a warm, brotherly feeling toward all men he may come into contact with, whether monk, pilgrim or just plain visitor — a fact which may shed some light on the springs of the famous Athonite hospitality.

Athos is not a thriving community at the moment. The present monastic population is estimated at approximately 2,000 by the author. This is a serious decline from a population of nearly 7,500 at the beginning of this century.

"How to stop this unfortunate trend towards a decrease of the monastic population of Athos," says the author, "is the biggest and

most vital problem that now concerns many Athonite monks." The fact, however, that such a depletion in the monastic population did occur several times before in the thousand-year-old history of the community seems to give solace to those there.

"They believe," the author reports, "that this unique Pan-Orthodox democracy of monks will continue to exist until the end of time." And this, too, is a reflection of the fierceness of their faith in the righteousness of their goal.

MICHAEL CHOUKAS



Copyright and Use:

As an ATLAS user, you may print, download, or send articles for individual use according to fair use as defined by U.S. and international copyright law and as otherwise authorized under your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement.

No content may be copied or emailed to multiple sites or publicly posted without the copyright holder(s)' express written permission. Any use, decompiling, reproduction, or distribution of this journal in excess of fair use provisions may be a violation of copyright law.

This journal is made available to you through the ATLAS collection with permission from the copyright holder(s). The copyright holder for an entire issue of a journal typically is the journal owner, who also may own the copyright in each article. However, for certain articles, the author of the article may maintain the copyright in the article. Please contact the copyright holder(s) to request permission to use an article or specific work for any use not covered by the fair use provisions of the copyright laws or covered by your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement. For information regarding the copyright holder(s), please refer to the copyright information in the journal, if available, or contact ATLA to request contact information for the copyright holder(s).

About ATLAS:

The ATLA Serials (ATLAS®) collection contains electronic versions of previously published religion and theology journals reproduced with permission. The ATLAS collection is owned and managed by the American Theological Library Association (ATLA) and received initial funding from Lilly Endowment Inc.

The design and final form of this electronic document is the property of the American Theological Library Association.

BOOK NOTES

F. VAN DER MEER and CHRISTINE MOHRMANN, *Atlas of the Early Christian World*. Translated and edited by Mary F. Hedlund and H. H. Rowley. London and Edinburgh: Thomas Nelson and Sons, Ltd., 1958. Pp. 216; 42 maps; 620 ill. \$15.00.

This magnificent volume is much more than an atlas. It is a monumental, vivid survey of the first six centuries of the Christian era and would form a valuable companion volume to D. Talbot Rice's *The Beginnings of Christian Art* (Abingdon Press, 1957). The forty-two maps in color are gathered in the front of the book for easy reference and are invaluable for a geographical knowledge of the early Christian Church.

The main text principally serves to outline and explain the 620 beautiful reproductions that form the real basis of this volume. One of the excellent features of this volume is the use of translations from pagan and early Christian writers themselves as commentary on the plates. The book is divided into three principal chapters. I: "The Church of the Martyrs A.D. 50-313"; II: "The Church of the Empire A.D. 313-600"; and III: "The Fathers of the Church and Early Christian Literature."

The cooperation of four scholars in the publication of this volume makes it truly an international work. The magnificent plates illustrate all kinds of aspects of early Christian life ranging from portraits of Christ, Baptism, Eucharist, Burial, Church architecture to the most important centers in early Christianity as well as the most important people.

The plates, the maps, and the commentary provide a triple source of edification and delight for the reader. "The authors can safely claim that in its scope and quality this magnificent collection of illustrations is unique." (Foreword by H. H. Rowley) We must agree wholeheartedly.

JOHN E. REXINE



Copyright and Use:

As an ATLAS user, you may print, download, or send articles for individual use according to fair use as defined by U.S. and international copyright law and as otherwise authorized under your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement.

No content may be copied or emailed to multiple sites or publicly posted without the copyright holder(s)' express written permission. Any use, decompiling, reproduction, or distribution of this journal in excess of fair use provisions may be a violation of copyright law.

This journal is made available to you through the ATLAS collection with permission from the copyright holder(s). The copyright holder for an entire issue of a journal typically is the journal owner, who also may own the copyright in each article. However, for certain articles, the author of the article may maintain the copyright in the article. Please contact the copyright holder(s) to request permission to use an article or specific work for any use not covered by the fair use provisions of the copyright laws or covered by your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement. For information regarding the copyright holder(s), please refer to the copyright information in the journal, if available, or contact ATLA to request contact information for the copyright holder(s).

About ATLAS:

The ATLA Serials (ATLAS®) collection contains electronic versions of previously published religion and theology journals reproduced with permission. The ATLAS collection is owned and managed by the American Theological Library Association (ATLA) and received initial funding from Lilly Endowment Inc.

The design and final form of this electronic document is the property of the American Theological Library Association.

Msgr. Etteldorf sees fertile ground among non-Catholic Christians. This is an attitude which is characteristic of the Roman Catholic Church and one which the Eastern Orthodox Church has deplored and continues to deplore, especially since the Middle East is an area of vital concern to Eastern Christianity.

Certainly the reader must acknowledge with admiration the philanthropic gestures of the Roman Catholic Church to Moslem, non-Catholic Christian, and Roman Catholic alike, where these gestures have been and are examples of true Christian charity, but we must not be misled into believing that the Middle East is or should be a stronghold of Roman Catholicism. Minority rights should be protected and better relations with the Arabs would probably be more likely with attempts to understand the Arab psychology on his own cultural and religious terms rather than by imposition from without or proselytizing from within.

The Catholic Church in the Middle East is a fascinating book, simply and clearly written. It affords the reader a convenient compendium of information about Catholics in the Middle East. This is obviously not a book that gives any idea of Christianity in the Middle East (particularly Eastern Orthodox Christianity) as a whole. Its Roman Catholic orientation makes it useful only as a source of information for or about that faith and serves as a warning for those of other Christian faiths who have a vital interest in the future of the Middle East.

JOHN E. REXINE

D. TALBOT RICE, *The Beginnings of Christian Art*. Nashville and New York: Abingdon Press, 1957. Frontispiece, 3 color plates, 72 black and white photographs, 22 line drawings. Pp. 223. \$7.95.

This compact volume by the Watson-Gordon Professor of the history of art at Edinburgh University, D. Talbot Rice, is a commendable introduction to the beginnings of Christian art. Rice's survey of Christian art carries the reader from the primitive foundations through the early mediaeval period and has the distinction of paying special attention to the development, history, and influence of Byzantine art down to the sixteenth century of our era.

This book is divided into five large parts, which include a total of sixteen chapters. Each part is conveniently preceded by a general outline of its contents. Part I on "The Foundations" includes a discussion,

under specific chapter headings, of the picturesque style, the expressionist style, and the neo-Attic style, which are the general categories into which Mr. Rice divides Christian art. Part II, "The First Flowering," includes a detailed discussion of early Christian art in Rome and the rest of Italy, Constantinople and the Eastern Mediterranean, the Eighth Century in the East, and problems in chronology. Part III, "Developments in the West," is an informative survey of painting in Italy from the Eighth to the Twelfth centuries as well as a survey of the art north of the Alps up to the Twelfth century and a chapter on early Christian art in Britain. Part IV, "The Second Flowering in the East," returns to Byzantium for the story of Byzantine art in the Ninth, Tenth, and Eleventh centuries, Twelfth century Eastern art, and Byzantine art in the Eleventh and Twelfth centuries. The last part, Part V, is entitled "Later Byzantine Art," and includes a survey of painting in the Balkans from the Thirteenth to the Sixteenth centuries, later Byzantine painting in Greece, and panel painting in the Byzantine world.

The approach in this book is the art-historical approach with some limited aesthetic appreciation and evaluation. The main concern is with the history of painting and mosaics, sculpture, architecture, and other art areas, though occasionally mentioned, are not included because they are readily available in separate treatises as special subjects.

The particular merit of this book is that it calls the attention of the reader to an area in Christian art which, though quite important for the development of subsequent Christian art and in itself, is often neglected in the West, and that is the Byzantine world and the part played by Constantinople. The unique continuity of this Byzantine Christian art from the early Fourth to the Fifteenth century is vividly portrayed and the significance of this achievement (accomplished nowhere else in the Christian world) is carefully noted.

Interesting, too, is the comparison in aesthetic terms made between the treasures and outlooks of the Eastern and Western Christian worlds: "In the one area (i.e., the Byzantine) ecclesiastic form permeated every facet of life; in the other (i.e., the Western) the panoply of a worldly, battle-loving emperor was hallowed in the service of the faith. We see here the very features which distinguish western from eastern Christianity to the present time. In the East the spiritual world exists and flourishes in its own right, and is something distinct from the world of everyday. In the West mundane forms dominate even in spiritual affairs, and the two are closely knit together." (p. 125)

The survey of Christian art, both Eastern and Western, is a valuable contribution to the art-historical literature of the English-speaking and English-reading world. Incorporating discussions of the most recent art-historical theories, scholarship, and art discoveries, Professor Rice has presented for the general reader a competent, well-documented, clearly written, and profusely illustrated volume, which will challenge the reader to review his Christian art history, develop his aesthetic and historic sense, as well as introduce him to areas of Christian art with which he should be familiar but probably is not. Professor Rice's book fills the need for a book on Christian art with a much needed and fair "total" Christian orientation.

JOHN E. REXINE

BALMER H. KELLY, Editor, *The Layman's Bible Commentary: Introduction to the Bible*, Vol. I; *Hosea, Joel, Amos, Obadiah, Jonah*, Vol. XIV. Richmond, Virginia: John Knox Press, 1959. Pp. 171 and 176. \$2.00 each.

The above volumes are two of a 25-volume series which has been carefully designed to meet the need for a Bible study tool in layman's language. Within its pages the meaning of the Holy Scripture is opened up, passage by passage, in informative terms.

All space in the LBC volumes is used for thorough exposition. The editors and authors are outstanding interpreters of the Old and New Testaments, chosen for their ability to write within the layman's grasp. (Note: opposite the title page is a complete listing of volumes and writers.)

In the LBC, technical terms are avoided (including Greek and Hebrew words), and every effort is bent toward making this commentary useful to the greatest number of students and teachers.

Many lay men and women will find the LBC volumes useful for personal and family study of the Bible.

The *Layman's Bible Commentary* is published in Canada by the Ryerson Press of Toronto, and throughout the British Commonwealth by SCM Press of London.

JOHN E. REXINE

LEROY H. APPLETON and STEPHEN BRIDGES, *Symbolism in Liturgical Art*. Introduction by Maurice Lavanoux. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1959. Pp. 120. \$3.50.

This practical handbook illustrates and explains the 134 symbols



Copyright and Use:

As an ATLAS user, you may print, download, or send articles for individual use according to fair use as defined by U.S. and international copyright law and as otherwise authorized under your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement.

No content may be copied or emailed to multiple sites or publicly posted without the copyright holder(s)' express written permission. Any use, decompiling, reproduction, or distribution of this journal in excess of fair use provisions may be a violation of copyright law.

This journal is made available to you through the ATLAS collection with permission from the copyright holder(s). The copyright holder for an entire issue of a journal typically is the journal owner, who also may own the copyright in each article. However, for certain articles, the author of the article may maintain the copyright in the article. Please contact the copyright holder(s) to request permission to use an article or specific work for any use not covered by the fair use provisions of the copyright laws or covered by your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement. For information regarding the copyright holder(s), please refer to the copyright information in the journal, if available, or contact ATLA to request contact information for the copyright holder(s).

About ATLAS:

The ATLA Serials (ATLAS®) collection contains electronic versions of previously published religion and theology journals reproduced with permission. The ATLAS collection is owned and managed by the American Theological Library Association (ATLA) and received initial funding from Lilly Endowment Inc.

The design and final form of this electronic document is the property of the American Theological Library Association.

STEVEN RUNCIMAN, *Byzantine Civilization*. New York: Meridian Books, 1958. Second Printing. Paper-bound. Pp. 255. \$1.35.

Steven Runciman's *Byzantine Civilization*, first published in 1933, is probably the first volume of its kind to be now made available to the general public in convenient, handsome paperback form. It is a striking sign that the civilization of Byzantium is slowly being recognized as being of prime historical and cultural importance. Steven Runciman, a world renowned Byzantine scholar, has been a principal figure in resuscitating a general interest in the Byzantine world and asserting the historical significance of Byzantine civilization for the general reader, making every effort to demonstrate clearly and concisely to the English reader an unprejudiced, unbiased picture of one of the world's truly great cultural heritages.

In this compact book of twelve interesting and highly lucid chapters, Runciman covers with amazing deftness such topics as "The Foundation of Constantinople," "Historical Outline" (of Byzantine history), "The Imperial Constitution and the Reign of Law," "The Administration," "Religion and the Church," "The Army: the Navy: the Diplomatic Service," "Commerce," "Town and Country Life," "Education and Learning," "Byzantine Literature," "Byzantine Art," and "Byzantium and the Neighboring World." There are also a list of Roman Emperors from Constantine I to Constantine XI, a bibliographical note, and notes to each chapter.

It can truly be said of this fine book that it gets at the essence of the Byzantine achievement and portrays vividly the heart and soul of the Byzantine world to the general reader. This is not a history book nor a dry chronicling of events but rather a brilliant assessment of the cultural achievements of the Byzantine Empire. In Runciman's own words Byzantium "... had left a glorious legacy in learning and in art; it had raised whole countries from barbarism and had given refinement to others; its strength and its intelligence for centuries had been the protection of Christendom. For eleven centuries Constantinople had been the centre of the world of light." The fall of Constantinople on May 29, 1453 is called a tragedy by Runciman, a tragedy which entailed finality. "The quick brilliance, the interest and aestheticism of the Greek, the proud stability and the administrative competence of the Roman, the transcendental intensity of the Christian from the East, welded together into a fluid sensitive mass, were put now to sleep." (p. 240)

With these words on the concluding page of his book Runciman

brilliantly summarizes his own brilliant evaluation of a brilliant and unique civilization.

JOHN E. REXINE

FRANCIS DVORNIK, *The Idea of Apostolicity in Byzantium and the Legend of the Apostle Andrew. (Dumbarton Oaks Studies IV).* Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1958. Pp. 342. \$6.00.

This book by one of the world's leading Byzantinists, Professor Dvornik of Harvard's Dumbarton Oaks Research Library and Collection, is an exhaustive historical study of the idea of apostolicity in Byzantium and what Dvornik considers to be the legend of the Apostle Andrew in connection with Constantinople. This book was written in an attempt to clarify the Byzantine policy of adaptation of political administrative forms to ecclesiastical administrative forms and to show how the West in effect forced the East to adopt the argument of apostolicity as a counter claim to the West's demands for submission and primacy on the basis of St. Peter's apostolicity in Rome.

Father Dvornik's book is much too fully worked out to be fairly discussed in any great detail in such a brief review as this but some major points of the book should be noted. The story of the foundation of Constantinople by Andrew, Dvornik admits, could very well have originated at the end of the third or fourth century. However, though this was possible, on the basis of historical and philological evidence, there is no indication that it was so formulated at such an early date. No one in the Byzantine world saw the need for an argument from apostolic foundation for the ecclesiastical organization. It was not until the sixth and seventh centuries that the need was seen for such an argument on a major scale and the first codification of the legend of Andrew's founding of the see of Byzantium can be safely and conservatively dated toward the close of the seventh and the first half of the eighth centuries. This, of course, does not preclude the existence of an oral tradition or even of an earlier written tradition. Dvornik maintains that every condition for an Andrew tradition existed from the time of Constantius at the latest. This acceptance by both East and West was made plausible by the belief that Andrew preached the Christian Gospel in Scythia and Achaia and certainly Thrace and Byzantium appeared to be the obvious connections between his missionary work in these two regions.



Copyright and Use:

As an ATLAS user, you may print, download, or send articles for individual use according to fair use as defined by U.S. and international copyright law and as otherwise authorized under your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement.

No content may be copied or emailed to multiple sites or publicly posted without the copyright holder(s)' express written permission. Any use, decompiling, reproduction, or distribution of this journal in excess of fair use provisions may be a violation of copyright law.

This journal is made available to you through the ATLAS collection with permission from the copyright holder(s). The copyright holder for an entire issue of a journal typically is the journal owner, who also may own the copyright in each article. However, for certain articles, the author of the article may maintain the copyright in the article. Please contact the copyright holder(s) to request permission to use an article or specific work for any use not covered by the fair use provisions of the copyright laws or covered by your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement. For information regarding the copyright holder(s), please refer to the copyright information in the journal, if available, or contact ATLA to request contact information for the copyright holder(s).

About ATLAS:

The ATLA Serials (ATLAS®) collection contains electronic versions of previously published religion and theology journals reproduced with permission. The ATLAS collection is owned and managed by the American Theological Library Association (ATLA) and received initial funding from Lilly Endowment Inc.

The design and final form of this electronic document is the property of the American Theological Library Association.

CONSTANTINE CAVARNOS, *Byzantine Sacred Art*. Institute for Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies, 113 Gilbert Rd., Belmont 78, Mass., 1957. Pp. ix +111, and 11 illustrations. \$3.00.

Wide interest has been manifest of late in Byzantine art, and the appearance of this compact book will certainly be welcomed. This work will guide and enlighten those who have this interest and will lead those who thirst for the spiritual values of Byzantine art to its essence, and will generally dispel any ignorance and misconception that exist today concerning this sacred art.

Constantine Cavarnos makes available to English readers for the first time selected writings of Fotis Kontoglou, eminent artist and writer, a devout Greek Orthodox who has dedicated his life to the Holy Tradition of Byzantine Iconography and has become the leading figure in the revival of this art in Greece.

Cavarnos painstakingly gathered, compiled and translated various articles and excerpts of Kontoglou on Byzantine art and tradition that were scattered throughout numerous newspapers, encyclopedias, periodicals and books. As a result, the reader will find between two covers such varied yet related subjects as: Ancient Greece and Byzantium, Byzantine Iconography, Byzantine Art in Yugoslavia, Byzantine Iconography during the Turkish Rule, Iconography of the Pantocrator, Architecture, Hymnody, Select Statements on the Appreciation of Byzantine Art, and others.

Dr. Cavarnos has contributed a preface, introduction, footnotes, list of illustrations and an index of names.

In the preface, Mr. Cavarnos gives us a concise picture of Kontoglou, his studies and searchings in Europe, his discovery of the treasures of Byzantine art and tradition in his native country, his subsequent accomplishments as a church decorator and iconographer, and achievements as an author. Cavarnos indicates also how the present book came into being, its premises, aim and general nature.

In the introduction he clearly presents Kontoglou's views and beliefs on Byzantine Art and Iconography, spiritual and physical beauty, secular, humanistic art and sacred, traditional art, a comparison between Byzantine Art and Western Renaissance Art, the nature of the iconographer and aids on the appreciation of Byzantine art.

Dr. Cavarnos' translation is not only competent but fully faithful in rendering Kontoglou's captivating and vigorous style.

The approach of this book is unique in our time of esthetic evaluation and archaeological description, in that it is a spiritual approach to a spiritual subject. The outer aspect of Byzantine art is not described at the expense of its inner essence as often as is the case. It successfully takes one to its spiritual essence. However, the historical aspect is not ignored, but is well woven in the text as a necessary element.

Fine illustrations of Byzantine art, which are closely related to the text, enhance the book. These are of outstanding Byzantine churches, mosaics, and paintings, including some from Kontoglou's own hand.

The writings of Kontoglou presented in this volume stress the general essence of the liturgical arts of Iconography, Architecture, Hymnody and Music as a whole and their inter-relatedness. Thus, Kontoglou writes: "The character of the Gospels has been faithfully imprinted upon the works of Orthodox iconography, hymnody, and music, which were made by Byzantium." Again, "All the Byzantine fine arts are really one and the same in their essence: all express the same thing, they differ only in the means that each employs and the sense to which it appeals." And again, "All the works of Byzantine Art — discourses, hymns, icons, architecture, and so on — are aids for understanding and remembering the word of God."

One of this book's virtues is that it impresses upon the reader that Byzantine art is not "quaint Archaeology," but is alive and valid today and has "eternal value, like Christianity, which it expresses. And just as the religion of Christ has been, is, and shall always be the truth for the human soul and heart, so also is Byzantine art. . . . Byzantine art does not grow old; it is always new, like the religion of Christ."

Kontoglou astutely relates Byzantine art to modern art, asserting that "all the 'trends' and searchings of modern had been actualized centuries ago by this Eastern art, and not experimentally and cerebrally, as happens in the case of today's 'modern' artist, but naturally and truly, as the expression of deep spiritual life. That is why Byzantine art is eternal; that is why it is universal."

Byzantine art has been accused of being fixed, rigid, and of imposing too many restrictions on the artist. Kontoglou capably clears up this misconception and makes some revealing statements concerning evolution of art, tradition, and freedom of the artist which deserve careful consideration. He answers the first by indication that "Byzantine iconography does not remain fixed but changes from artist to artist

and from epoch to epoch. But not in the way certain artists understand change." He points out this evolution is not "a random flight from what existed before, and the making of arbitrary and improvised things," but "a natural . . . variation of a form . . . developed by many artists . . . in such a manner that the organic unity between the new variant and the permanent type of this form is not broken up, but its inner and outer character preserved. . . ." He adds "only very naive persons call this copying." Thus, "the new forms simply emerge out of the old in a natural and unforced way." For the artist to remain within the scope of this form to the contrary does not limit, states Kontoglou, but gives him freedom and his work intensity, "for unfettered by any necessity to invent a new type, he can devote himself completely to the task of execution."

This book is recommended to all who are interested in religious art and especially to those who are interested in Byzantine Orthodox Arts. The layman, the artist, critic and historian will find much of value in this volume. To those that belong to the Orthodox Faith, whether clergy or lay, this book, *Byzantine Sacred Art* by Constantine Cavarnos, is a veritable beacon of light that will help guide them through the sea of today's anti-spiritual religious art to an understanding, seeking, and expression of genuine Orthodox art.

DEMETRIOS DUKAS

ARNOLD J. TOYNBEE, *Hellenism: The History of Civilization*. New York and London: Oxford University Press, 1959. Pp. xv and 272.

It has been rightly said that Dr. Toynbee "has more facts at his command and a wider vision" of world history than any other person alive. This, perhaps, leads him to form, but also to formalize general rules of history, which he tries to verify in the historical development of different peoples at different stages. Thus, he interprets dissimilar situations according to his *a priori* rules because he believes that all civilizations pass through similar transitions and "have been and are and will continue to be contemporaneous with one another." Of course, the correctness of this tenet is very debatable, as well as the correctness of his general system of "organizing history in a pattern." Often his "rules" are based only on unwarranted assumptions, on superficial similarities, on the comparison of non-essential elements and negligence.



Copyright and Use:

As an ATLAS user, you may print, download, or send articles for individual use according to fair use as defined by U.S. and international copyright law and as otherwise authorized under your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement.

No content may be copied or emailed to multiple sites or publicly posted without the copyright holder(s)' express written permission. Any use, decompiling, reproduction, or distribution of this journal in excess of fair use provisions may be a violation of copyright law.

This journal is made available to you through the ATLAS collection with permission from the copyright holder(s). The copyright holder for an entire issue of a journal typically is the journal owner, who also may own the copyright in each article. However, for certain articles, the author of the article may maintain the copyright in the article. Please contact the copyright holder(s) to request permission to use an article or specific work for any use not covered by the fair use provisions of the copyright laws or covered by your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement. For information regarding the copyright holder(s), please refer to the copyright information in the journal, if available, or contact ATLA to request contact information for the copyright holder(s).

About ATLAS:

The ATLA Serials (ATLAS®) collection contains electronic versions of previously published religion and theology journals reproduced with permission. The ATLAS collection is owned and managed by the American Theological Library Association (ATLA) and received initial funding from Lilly Endowment Inc.

The design and final form of this electronic document is the property of the American Theological Library Association.

The general motive of the author is apologetic. Cadbury tries to confirm the reliability of the Book of Acts in relation to its Greek, Roman, Jewish and early Christian background. The understanding of all this is important for an understanding of the history of the Early Church in Acts. To do this one needs to have a knowledge of the historic and cultural situation which surrounds the Book of Acts.

REV. DEMETRIOS J. CONSTANTELOS

LIONEL S. THORNTON, *Christ and the Church*. Westminster (England): Dacre Press, 1956. Pp. 151.

This book is the third part of a work on "The Form of the Servant." The author begins with the assumption that the doctrine of the Church is of vital significance and not merely a corollary of the Christian faith. If we believe in Christ we must believe in the Church, for Christ's message to man is embodied in it.

As in the case with other authors, Thornton traces the origin of the Christian Ecclesia back to the Old Testament. He tries to prove the unity of the Revelation, the Old Covenant made between God and man through Abraham and Moses, and the New, concluded between God and man in Christ. The Church is the New Israel, which is a continuation of the Old Israel whose special call is traced back by way of David and Moses to Abraham. The New Israel marks the culmination of the Messianic expectations.

A basic conception of the author is that Christ and the Church constitute a single divine-human mystery. This mystery is understood only "by paying careful attention to the forms and modes in which and through which it is unfolded in scripture." Hence he examines the various analogies and unities that are found in both the Old and the New Testaments. Thornton presents the analogies and the relationships between the old creation of the Old Testament with the new creation of the New Testament manifested in Christ; the Old Adam and the New Adam; the transfiguration of Christ in analogy to the life of the Church and so forth.

The author is obscure at points. It seems to me that though he might be original and probably a pioneer in such an approach to this important subject, he tends to overdraw analogies between Old and New Testament events, events which might be simply historical or circumstantial without any real significance for the New Testament.

REV. DEMETRIOS J. CONSTANTELOS



Copyright and Use:

As an ATLAS user, you may print, download, or send articles for individual use according to fair use as defined by U.S. and international copyright law and as otherwise authorized under your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement.

No content may be copied or emailed to multiple sites or publicly posted without the copyright holder(s)' express written permission. Any use, decompiling, reproduction, or distribution of this journal in excess of fair use provisions may be a violation of copyright law.

This journal is made available to you through the ATLAS collection with permission from the copyright holder(s). The copyright holder for an entire issue of a journal typically is the journal owner, who also may own the copyright in each article. However, for certain articles, the author of the article may maintain the copyright in the article. Please contact the copyright holder(s) to request permission to use an article or specific work for any use not covered by the fair use provisions of the copyright laws or covered by your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement. For information regarding the copyright holder(s), please refer to the copyright information in the journal, if available, or contact ATLA to request contact information for the copyright holder(s).

About ATLAS:

The ATLA Serials (ATLAS®) collection contains electronic versions of previously published religion and theology journals reproduced with permission. The ATLAS collection is owned and managed by the American Theological Library Association (ATLA) and received initial funding from Lilly Endowment Inc.

The design and final form of this electronic document is the property of the American Theological Library Association.

BOOK REVIEWS

DENO JOHN GEANAKOPLOS, *Emperor Michael Palaeologus and the West (1258-1282). A Study in Byzantine-Latin Relations.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1959. Pp. xii and 434.

The recovery of Constantinople by the Emperor Michael VIII (1261) and his successful defence against its Western foes were the most important achievements of the Greeks in the 13th century. This historic feat is masterfully presented by Professor Geanakoplos in this book. His work is a vivid, well documented, and convincing narration, which in its original form was his doctoral dissertation at Harvard University (1953). Now totally revised, the work is an important contribution to Medieval history.

In the introduction the author discusses the issues and the sources in general. Then he deals extensively with his main subject. He divides his material into three parts (subdivided into a prologue, 14 chapters, and an epilogue): "The Empire of Nicaea and Michael Palaeologus," "The First Years of the Restored Byzantine Empire (1261-1266)," and "The conflict Between Michael and the King of Sicily, Charles of Anjou (1266-1282)." Two appendices, an extensive annotated bibliography, a glossary of Byzantine titles and an index, four illustrations and seven maps are also added.

The first part is devoted to the early career of Michael in the Empire of Nicaea, his usurpation of the imperial crown, his victory at Pelagonia, and the recovery of Constantinople from the Latins. In the second part the author is concerned with the five difficult years following the restoration. He discusses the many dangerous problems faced by Michael, especially those arising from his Western, avowed and secret, enemies who wanted their re-establishment in Constantinople. The last part deals with the almost desperate, but finally successful attempts of Michael to stem the flood of threats and preparations against him, and with his conflict with Charles of Anjou in which most of the states around the Mediterranean area were in some way involved. In those critical years (1266-1282) Michael attempted through diverse means and manners to annihilate his adversary's plans.

He even accepted the submission and subjugation of the Eastern Orthodox Church to the Pope of Rome by recognizing and putting into practice the decisions of the Council of Lyons (1274). This agreement, although nominal in nature, was an abomination for the Eastern Orthodox subjects of the Byzantine Empire. In the end the danger was averted through the notorious Sicilian Vespers (1282), with which Michael seems to have had something to do. However, the fact remained that since then the Byzantine Empire was permanently and irreparably weakened internally and externally to such a degree that its doom was imminent — 171 years hence.

The author focuses his investigation on Emperor Michael and his relations with the West, and for this reason he treats very lightly the other problems of the Empire: the relations with the Eastern peoples, its internal affairs, and especially its financial status. Yet, underneath the main theme, there lies vividly the decisive power of the will of the Greek people as it was expressed in their religious faith and national resistance, which always opposed the wilful infiltration of and subjugation to the West. This powerful will was personified in Michael, who, however, for the political expediency of the moment yielded to the Western guiles and, thus, almost destroyed his own avowed policy of a politically independent and strong Byzantine Empire. One may also say, from another point of view, that this book is a study *ad hoc* of the theme: political causes and fluctuations have often determined the religious policies of nations, not rarely to the detriment of supreme spiritual scopes and even to the detriment of their political aims as such.

Professor Geanakoplos treats his theme from a very objective point of view. Perhaps for the first time, the Greek aspect is presented simultaneously with the up to now prevalent Western aspect. The hero of the book is, of course, Michael, who is clearly pictured as a strong-willed, tenacious, determined, capable, and resourceful leader, a really imposing personality, who loved his country and, though not always through the most honorable means, strove to restore it to its former power and glory. The main reason of the "Machiavellian" diplomacy of Michael was not so much his ambition for personal aggrandizement, as his desire to safeguard the restored Byzantine Empire against the machinations of the West. It was the Western Intrigues which dictated Michael's ways of counteracting similarly. Perhaps, it is for this reason that this scholarly research in history holds the reader's interest as if it were fiction — and this is meant as a sincere tribute to the lively and captivating way in which the author conceived and presented his theme.

The conscientious and thorough use of all the sources available, their re-examination under new and brighter light, the new interpretation as presented by Professor Geanakoplos, his sound and convincing argumentation, his masterful conception, composition, and working out of the entire theme, and above all his objective but lively outlook, will certainly recommend this book highly to the undiluted esteem of the historians and prove it to be a worthy and illuminating contribution to Medieval history.

COSTAS M. PROUSSIS

MARKOS SIOTIS, *'H Θεία Εὐχαριστία (The Holy Eucharist: The Information of the New Testament concerning the Holy Eucharist, in the light of the Ecclesiastical Interpretation)*. Thessalonica: M. Stougiannaki Press, 1957. Pp. 71.

The liturgical "renaissance" which has prevailed so extensively in the West during this century, and which has been inspired primarily by fresh and objective studies on the liturgical life and theology of the Eastern Church, has also a compelling character for the contemporary Greek Orthodox theologian whose task lies in his obligation of studying and exposing both to the Orthodox and non-Orthodox the treasures of the liturgical life of his Church. Professor Siotis, of the Faculties of the Theological School of the University of Thessalonica and of the University of Athens, has done precisely this, namely, the presentation, in a comprehensive way, of the liturgical theology of the Eastern Church. To be sure, the author is eager to inform his readers, from the very beginning, that his intention is not to present any critical analysis of the works on Orthodox Liturgical Theology which till now have been published. He wants rather to present a systematic synopsis of the teaching of the Orthodox Church concerning the Eucharist, that is to say, the already expressed ecclesiastical interpretation of this Sacrament. In other words, Professor Siotis bases his research on purely Patristic grounds and on the genuine roots of the ecclesiastical tradition. This approach has far reaching effects indeed, because the author proceeds to the study of the Sacrament on the Orthodox ecclesiological presupposition, through which the understanding of our Liturgical Theology is magnified. Consequently, Ecclesiology and Liturgical Theology form an inseparable structure of the Orthodox Theology, an "existential" united reality in which one lives his Orthodox faith and at the same time participates in the joys of liturgical experience.

Thus Professor Siotis' first task is to demonstrate the close relationship and cross-reference of the essence of the Sacrament with the



Copyright and Use:

As an ATLAS user, you may print, download, or send articles for individual use according to fair use as defined by U.S. and international copyright law and as otherwise authorized under your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement.

No content may be copied or emailed to multiple sites or publicly posted without the copyright holder(s)' express written permission. Any use, decompiling, reproduction, or distribution of this journal in excess of fair use provisions may be a violation of copyright law.

This journal is made available to you through the ATLAS collection with permission from the copyright holder(s). The copyright holder for an entire issue of a journal typically is the journal owner, who also may own the copyright in each article. However, for certain articles, the author of the article may maintain the copyright in the article. Please contact the copyright holder(s) to request permission to use an article or specific work for any use not covered by the fair use provisions of the copyright laws or covered by your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement. For information regarding the copyright holder(s), please refer to the copyright information in the journal, if available, or contact ATLA to request contact information for the copyright holder(s).

About ATLAS:

The ATLA Serials (ATLAS®) collection contains electronic versions of previously published religion and theology journals reproduced with permission. The ATLAS collection is owned and managed by the American Theological Library Association (ATLA) and received initial funding from Lilly Endowment Inc.

The design and final form of this electronic document is the property of the American Theological Library Association.

EMPIRE AND DESERT: ANTINOMIES OF CHRISTIAN HISTORY

GEORGES FLOROVSKY

CHRISTIANITY entered history as a new social order, or rather a new social dimension. From the very beginning Christianity was not primarily a "doctrine," but exactly a "community." There was not only a "Message" to be proclaimed and delivered, and "Good News" to be declared. There was precisely a New Community, distinct and peculiar, in the process of growth and formation, to which members were called and recruited. Indeed, "fellowship" (*koinonia*) was the basic category of Christian existence. Primitive Christians felt themselves to be closely knit and bound together in a unity which radically transcended all human boundaries—of race, of culture, of social rank, and indeed the whole dimension of "this world." They were brethren to each other, members of "One Body," even of the "Body of Christ." This glorious phrase of St. Paul admirably summarizes the common experience of the faithful. In spite of the radical novelty of Christian experience, basic categories of interpretation were taken over from the Old Testament, of which the New Covenant was conceived to be the fulfilment and con-

summation. Christians were indeed "a chosen race, a royal priesthood, a holy nation, a people set apart" (I Peter 2:9). They were the New Israel, the "Little Flock," that is, that faithful "Remnant" to which it was God's good pleasure to give the Kingdom (Luke 12:32). Scattered sheep had to be brought together into "one fold," and assembled. The Church was exactly this "Assembly," *ekklesia tou Theou*—a permanent Assembly of the new "Chosen People" of God, never to be adjourned.

In "this world" Christians could be but pilgrims and strangers. Their true "citizenship," *politeuma*, was "in heaven" (Phil. 3:20). The Church herself was peregrinating through this world (*paroikousa*). "The Christian fellowship was a bit of extra-territorial jurisdiction on earth of the world above" (Frank Gavin). The Church was an "outpost of heaven" on the earth, or a "colony of heaven." It may be true that this attitude of radical detachment had originally an "apocalyptic" connotation, and was inspired by the expectation of an imminent *parousia*. Yet, even as an enduring historical society, the Church was bound to be detached from the world. An ethos of "spiritual segregation" was inherent in the very fabric of the Christian faith, as it was inherent in the faith of Ancient Israel. The Church herself was "a city," a *polis*, a new and peculiar "polity." In their baptismal profession Christians had "to renounce" this world, with all its vanity, and pride, and pomp—but also with all its natural ties, even family ties, and to take a solemn oath of allegiance to Christ the King, the only true King on earth and in heaven, to Whom

The Very Rev. Georges Florovsky is at present Associate Professor of Dogmatic Theology at the Holy Cross Orthodox Theological School, Brookline, Mass., as well as Professor of Eastern Church History at Harvard Divinity School. He is considered the outstanding contemporary Orthodox Theologian in this country. The present article is taken from THE GREEK ORTHODOX THEOLOGICAL REVIEW (50 Goddard Ave., Brookline 46, Mass., twice a year \$3.50).

all "authority" has been given. By this baptismal commitment Christians were radically separated from "this world." In this world they had no "permanent city." They were "citizens" of the "City to come," of which God Himself was builder and maker (Hebr. 13:14; cf. 11:10).

The Early Christians were often suspected and accused of civic indifference, and even of morbid "misanthropy," *odium generis humani*—which should be probably contrasted with the alleged "philanthropy" of the Roman Empire. The charge was not without substance. In his famous reply to Celsus, Origen was ready to admit the charge. Yet, what else could Christians have done, he asked. In every city, he explained, "we have another system of allegiance," *allo systema tes patridos* (*Contra Celsum*, VIII 75). Along with the civil community, the local Church. And she was for Christians their true home, or their "fatherland," and not their actual "native city." The anonymous writer of the admirable "Letter to Diognetus," written probably in the early years of the second century, elaborated this point with an elegant precision. Christians do not dwell in cities of their own, nor do they differ from the rest of men in speech and customs. "Yet, while they dwell in the cities of Greeks and Barbarians, as the lot of each is cast, the structure of their own polity is peculiar and paradoxical. . . . Every foreign land is a fatherland to them, and every fatherland is a foreign land. . . . Their conversation is on the earth, but their citizenship is in heaven." There was no passion in this attitude, no hostility, and no actual retirement from daily life. But there was a strong note of spiritual estrangement: "*and every fatherland is a foreign land.*" It was coupled, however, with an acute sense of responsibility. Christians were confined in the world, "kept" there as

in prison; but they also "kept the world together," just as the soul holds the body together. Moreover, this was precisely the task allotted to Christians by God, "which it is unlawful to decline" (*Ad Diognetum*, 5, 6). Christians might stay in their native cities, and faithfully perform their daily duties. But they were unable to give their full allegiance to any polity of this world, because their true commitment was elsewhere. They were socially committed and engaged in the Church, and not in the world. "For us nothing is more alien than public affairs," declared Tertullian: *nec ulla magis res aliena quam publica* (*Apologeticum*, 38:3). "I have withdrawn myself from the society," he said on another occasion: *secessi de populo* (*De Pallio*, 5). Christians were in this sense "outside society," voluntary outcasts and outlaws—outside of the social order of this world.

It would be utterly misleading to interpret the tension between Christians and the Roman Empire as a conflict or clash between the Church and the State. Indeed, the Christian Church was more than "a church," just as ancient Israel was at once a "church" and a "nation." Christians also were a nation, a "peculiar people," the People of God, *tertium genus*, neither Jew nor Greek. The Church was not just a "gathered community," or a voluntary association, for "religious" purposes alone. She was, and claimed to be, a distinct and autonomous "society," a distinct "polity." On the other hand, the Roman Empire was, and claimed to be, much more than just "a state." Since the Augustan reconstruction, in any case, Rome claimed to be just *the City*, a permanent and "eternal" City, *Urbs aeterna*, and an ultimate City also. In a sense, it claimed for itself an "eschatological dimension." It posed as an ultimate solution of the human problem. It was a Universal

Commonwealth, "a single Cosmopolis of the inhabited earth," the *Oikoumene*. Rome was offering "Peace," the *Pax Romana*, and "Justice" to all men and all nations under its rule and sway. It claimed to be the final embodiment of "Humanity," of all human values and achievements. "The Empire was, in effect, a politico-ecclesiastical institution. It was a 'church' as well as a 'state'; if it had not been both, it would have been alien from the ideas of the Ancient World" (Sir Ernest Baker). In the ancient society—in the ancient polis, in Hellenistic monarchies, in the Roman republic—"religious" convictions were regarded as an integral part of the political creed. "Religion" was an integral part of the "political" structure. No division of competence and "authority" could ever be admitted, and accordingly no division of loyalty or allegiance. The State was omnicompetent, and accordingly the allegiance had to be complete and unconditional. Loyalty to the State was itself a kind of religious devotion, in whatever particular form it might have been prescribed or imposed. In the Roman Empire it was the Cult of Caesars. The whole structure of the Empire was indivisibly "political" and "religious." The main purpose of the Imperial rule was usually defined as "Philanthropy," and often even as "Salvation." Accordingly, the Emperors were described as "Saviours."

In retrospect all these claims may seem to be but utopian delusions and wishful dreams, vain and futile, which they were indeed. Yet, these dreams were dreamt by the best people of that time—it is enough to mention Vergil. And the utopian dream of the "Eternal Rome" survived the collapse of the actual Empire and dominated the political thinking of Europe for centuries. Paradoxically, this dream was often cherished even by those who, by the logic

of their faith, should have been better protected against its deceiving charm and thrill. In fact, the vision of an abiding or "Eternal Rome" dominated also the Christian thought in the Middle Ages, both in the East, and in the West.

There was nothing anarchical in the attitude of Early Christians toward the Roman Empire. The "divine" origin of the State and of its authority was formally acknowledged already by St. Paul, and he himself had no difficulty in appealing to the protection of Roman magistrates and of Roman law. The positive value and function of the State were commonly admitted in the Christian circles. Even the violent invective in the book of Revelation was no exception. What was denounced there was iniquity and injustice of the actual Rome, but not the principle of political order. Christians could, in full sincerity and in good faith, protest their political innocence in the Roman courts and plead their loyalty to the Empire. In fact, Early Christians were devoutly praying for the State, for peace and order, and even for Caesars themselves. One finds a high appraisal of the Roman Empire even in those Christian writers of that time, who were notorious for their resistance, as Origen and Tertullian. The theological "justification" of the Empire originated already in the period of persecutions. Yet, Christian loyalty was, of necessity, a restricted loyalty. Of course, Christianity was in no sense a seditious plot, and Christians never intended to overthrow the existing order, although they did believe that it had ultimately to wither away. From the Roman point of view, however, Christians could not fail to appear seditious, not because they were in any sense mixed in politics, but precisely because they were not. Their political "indifference" was irritating to the Romans. They kept themselves away from the concerns of the Commonwealth

at a critical time of its struggle for existence. Not only did they claim "religious freedom" for themselves. They also claimed supreme authority for the Church. Although the Kingdom of God was emphatically "not of this world," it seemed to be a threat to the omnicompetent Kingdom of Man. The Church was, in a sense, a kind of "Resistance Movement" in the Empire. As Christopher Dawson has aptly said, "Christianity was the only remaining power in the world which could not be absorbed in the gigantic mechanism of the new servile state." Christians were not a political faction. Yet, their religious allegiance had an immediate "political" connotation. It has been well observed that monotheism itself was a "political problem" in the ancient world (Eric Peterson). Christians were bound to claim "autonomy" for themselves and for the Church. And this was precisely what the Empire could neither concede, nor even understand. Thus, the clash was inevitable, although it could be delayed.

The Church was a challenge to the Empire, and the Empire was a stumbling block for the Christians.

II

THE AGE OF CONSTANTINE is commonly regarded as a turning point of Christian history. After a protracted struggle with the Church, the Roman Empire at last capitulated. The Caesar himself was converted, and humbly applied for admission into the Church. Religious freedom was formally promulgated, and was emphatically extended to Christians. The confiscated property was restored to Christian communities. Those Christians who suffered disability and deportation in the years of persecution were now ordered back, and were received with honors. In fact, Constantine was offering to the Church not only

peace and freedom, but also protection and close cooperation. Indeed, he was urging the Church and her leaders to join with him in the "Renovation" of the Empire. This new turn of Imperial policy and tactics was received by Christians with appreciation, but not without some embarrassment and surprise. Christian response to the new situation was by no means unanimous. There were many among Christian leaders who were quite prepared to welcome unreservedly the conversion of Emperor and the prospective conversion of the Empire. But there were not a few who were apprehensive of the Imperial move. To be sure, one could but rejoice in the cessation of hostilities and in that freedom of public worship which now had been legally secured. But the major problem had not yet been solved, and it was a problem of extreme complexity. Indeed, it was a highly paradoxical problem.

Already Tertullian was asking certain awkward questions, although in his own time they were no more than rhetorical questions. Could Caesars accept Christ, and believe in Him? Now, Caesars obviously belonged to "the world." They were an integral part of the "secular" fabric, *necessarii saeculo*. Could then a Christian be Caesar, that is, belong at once to two conflicting orders, the Church and the World (*Apologeticum*, 21:24)? In the time of Constantine this concept of the "Christian Caesar" was still a riddle and a puzzle, despite the eloquent effort of Eusebius of Caesarea to elaborate the idea of the "Christian Empire." For many Christians there was an inner contradiction in the concept itself. Caesars were necessarily committed to the cause of "this world." But the Church was not of this world. The office of Caesars was intrinsically "secular." Was there really any room for Emperors, as Emperors, in the structure of Christian Community? It has been

recently suggested that probably Constantine himself was rather uneasy and uncertain precisely at this very point. It seems that one of the reasons for which he was delaying his own baptism, till his very last days, was precisely his dim feeling that it was inconvenient to be "Christian" and "Caesar" at the same time. Constantine's personal conversion constituted no problem. But as Emperor he was committed. He had to carry the burden of his exalted position in the Empire. He was still a "Divine Caesar." As Emperor, he was heavily involved in the traditions of the Empire, as much as he actually endeavored to disentangle himself. The transfer of the Imperial residence to a *new* City, away from the memories of the *old* pagan Rome, was a spectacular symbol of this noble effort. Yet, the Empire itself was still much the same as before, with its autocratic ethos and habits, with all its pagan practices, including the adoration and *apotheosis* of Caesars. We have good reasons to trust Constantine's personal sincerity. No doubt, he was deeply convinced that Christianity was the only power which could quicken the sick body of the Empire and supply a new principle of cohesion in the time of social disintegration. But obviously he was unable to abdicate his sovereign authority, or to renounce the world. Indeed, Constantine was firmly convinced that, by Divine Providence, he was entrusted with a high and holy mission, that he was chosen to reestablish the Empire, and to reestablish it on a Christian foundation. This conviction, more than any particular political theory, was the decisive factor in his policy, and in his actual mode of ruling.

The situation was intensely ambiguous. Had the Church to accept the Imperial offer and to assume the new task? Was it a welcome opportunity, or rather a dangerous compromise? In fact, the

experience of close cooperation with the Empire was never altogether happy and encouraging for Christians, even in the days of Constantine himself. The Empire did not appear to be an easy or comfortable ally and partner for the Church. Under Constantine's successors all inconveniences of "cooperation" became quite evident, even if we ignore the abortive attempt of Julian to reinstate Paganism. The leaders of the Church were compelled, time and again, to challenge the persistent attempts of Caesars to exercise their supreme authority also in religious matters. The rise of monasticism in the fourth century was no accident. It was rather an attempt to escape the Imperial problem, and to build an "autonomous" Christian Society outside of the boundaries of the Empire, "outside the camp." On the other hand, the Church could not evade her responsibility for the world, or surrender her missionary task. Indeed, the Church was concerned not only with individuals, but also with society, even with the whole of mankind. Even kingdoms of this world had to be brought ultimately into obedience to Christ. Nor was the Empire prepared to leave the Church alone, or to dispense with her help and service. The Church was already a strong institution, strong by her faith and discipline, and spread everywhere, even to the remote corners of the inhabited earth. Thus, the Church was forced finally into alliance with the Empire, by the double pressure of her own missionary vocation and of the traditional logic of Empire.

By the end of the fourth century Christianity was ultimately established as the official religion of the Roman Empire. Under Theodosius the Great, the Roman Empire formally committed itself to the Christian cause. Paganism was legally disavowed and proscribed. "Heresy" was also outlawed. The State for-

mally engaged in the maintenance of the Orthodox Faith. The basic presupposition of the new arrangement was *the Unity of the Christian Commonwealth*. There was but *One* and comprehensive *Christian Society*, which was at once a Church and a State. In this one society there were different orders or "powers," clearly distinguished but closely correlated—"spiritual" and "temporal," "ecclesiastical" and "political." But the "Society" itself was intrinsically *One*. This idea was by no means a new one. Ancient Israel was at once a Kingdom and a Church. The Roman Empire had always been a "politico-ecclesiastical institution," and it also retained this double character after it had been "christened." In the Christian Commonwealth "Churchmanship" and "Citizenship" were not only "co-extensive," but simply identical. Only Christians could be citizens. And all citizens were obliged to be Orthodox in belief and behavior. The Christian Commonwealth was conceived as a single "theocratic" structure. Moreover, the Roman Empire always regarded itself as a "Universal Kingdom," the only "Empire." As there was but One Church, the Church Universal, so there could be but One Kingdom, the Ecumenical Empire. The Church and the Kingdom were in effect but One Society, indivisible and undivided. *One Civitas—Respublica Christiana.* "The One Commonwealth of all mankind, conceived partly as an Empire—the surviving image of ancient Rome, but mainly and generally as a Church, is the essential society of that long period of human history which we call by the name of the Middle Ages. It was a fact, and not merely an idea; and yet it was also an idea, and not altogether a fact" (Sir Ernest Baker).

It was a momentous and magnificent achievement, a glorious vision, an ambitious claim. But it was also an ominous

and ambiguous achievement. In fact, the two orders, "spiritual" and "temporal," could never be truly integrated into one system. Old tensions continued inside of the "One Society," and the balance of "powers" in the Christian Commonwealth has been always unstable and insecure. It would be an anachronism to describe this internal tension between "powers" in the Medieval Commonwealth as a conflict or competition between the Church and the State, conceived as two distinct societies, with an appropriate sphere of competence and jurisdiction. In the Middle Ages, Church and State, as two distinct societies, simply did not exist. The conflict was between the two "powers" in the same society, and precisely for that very reason it was so vigorous and acute. In this respect there was no basic difference between the Christian East and the Christian West, as different as the actual course of events has been in these two areas of the Christian Commonwealth. The major problem was the same, in the East and in the West—the problem of a "Christian Society," of a "Holy Empire." It was but natural that this problem should assume special urgency and dimension precisely in the East. In the East "the Holy Empire" was a formidable reality, "a tangible fact in an actual world," in the phrase of James Bryce, while in the West it was rather an idea, or just a claim. Since Constantine the heart of the Empire was at Constantinople, and no longer in the old City of Rome. The story of Byzantium was an immediate continuation of Roman history. In the West, Roman order disintegrated at an early date. In the East, it survived for centuries. Even in Oriental garb, Byzantium continued to be "the Kingdom of the Romans," up to its very end. The main problem of Byzantium was precisely the problem of "the Eternal Rome." The whole weight of the

Empire was felt there much more than ever in the West. It is highly significant, however, that all "Byzantine problems" reappear in the West, with the same urgency and the same ambiguity, as soon as "Empire" had been reconstituted there, under Charlemagne and his successors. Indeed, Charlemagne regarded himself as a lawful successor to Constantine and Justinian. His claims and policy in the matters religious were almost identical with those of the Byzantine Caesars.

It has been often contended that in Byzantium the Church had surrendered her "freedom" into the hands of Caesars. The Byzantine system has been derogatorily labelled as a "Caesaropapism," with the assumption that Emperor was the actual ruler of the Church, even if he was never formally acknowledged to be her head. It has been said more than once that in Byzantium the Church simply ceased to exist, that is, to exist as an "independent institution," and was practically reduced to the status of a "liturgical department of the Empire." The evidence quoted in support of these charges, at first glance, may seem to be abundant and overwhelming. But it does not stand a closer examination. The charge of "Caesaropapism" is still maintained in certain quarters. It has been emphatically rejected by many competent students of Byzantium as a sheer misunderstanding, as a biased anachronism. Emperors were indeed rulers in the Christian Society, also in religious matters, but never rulers over the Church.

The story of Byzantium was an adventure in Christian politics. It was an unsuccessful and probably an unfortunate experiment. Yet it should be judged on its own terms.

III

JUSTINIAN HAS CLEARLY stated that basic principle of the Byzantine political

system in the preface to his Sixth Novel, dated March 16, 535:

"There are two major gifts which God has given unto men of His supernal clemency, the priesthood and the imperial authority—*hierosyne* and *basileia*; *sacerdotium* and *imperium*. Of these, the former is concerned with things divine; the latter presides over the human affairs and takes care of them. Proceeding from the same source, both adorn human life. Nothing is of greater concern for the emperors than the dignity of the priesthood, so that priests may in their turn pray to God for them. Now, if one is in every respect blameless and filled with confidence toward God, and the other does rightly and properly maintain in order the commonwealth entrusted to it, there will be a certain fair harmony established which will furnish whatsoever may be needful for mankind. We therefore are highly concerned for the true doctrines inspired by God and for the dignity of priests. We are convinced that, if they maintain their dignity, great benefits will be bestowed by God on us, and we shall firmly hold whatever we now possess, and in addition shall acquire those things which we have not yet secured. A happy ending always crowns those things which were undertaken in a proper manner, acceptable to God. This is the case, when sacred canons are carefully observed, which the glorious Apostles, the venerable eye-witnesses and ministers of the Divine Word, have handed down to us, and the holy Fathers have kept and explained."

This was at once a summary, and a program.

Justinian did not speak of State, or of Church. He spoke of two ministries, or of two agencies, which were established in the Christian Commonwealth. They were appointed by the same Divine authority and for the same ultimate purpose. As a "Divine gift," the Imperial power, *imperium*, was "independent" from the Priesthood, *sacerdotium*. Yet

it was "dependent" upon, and "subordinate" to, that purpose for which it had been Divinely established. This purpose was the faithful maintenance and promotion of the Christian truth. Thus, if "the Empire" as such was not subordinate to the Hierarchy, it was nevertheless subordinate to the Church, which was a Divinely appointed custodian of the Christian truth. In other words, the Imperial power was "legitimate" only *within* the Church. In any case, it was essentially subordinate to the Christian Faith, was bound by the precepts of the Apostles and Fathers, and in this respect "limited" by them. The legal status of the Emperor in the Commonwealth depended upon his good standing in the Church, under her doctrinal and canonical discipline. *Imperium* was at once an authority, and a service. And the terms of this service were set in rules and regulations of the Church. In his coronation oath, the Emperor had to profess the Orthodox faith and to take a vow of obedience to the decrees of the ecclesiastical Councils. This was no mere formality. "Orthodoxy was, as it were, the *supernationality of Byzantium*, the basic element of the life of the State and people" (I. I. Sokolov).

The place of Emperor in the Byzantine system was high and exalted. He was surrounded with a halo of theocratical splendor. The court ceremonial was rich and elaborate, and it was distinctively a religious ceremonial, a ritual, almost a kind of "Imperial liturgy." Yet, the Emperor was no more than a layman. He had a certain position in the Church, and a very prominent and high position. But it was a lay position. There was, as it were, a special office in the Church reserved for a layman. Emperors did not belong to the regular hierarchy of the Church. They were in no sense "ministers of Word and sacraments." Some special "priestly" character might be con-

ceded to them, and indeed has been often claimed and asserted. In any case, it was a very specific "Royal priesthood," clearly distinguishable from the "Ministerial priesthood" of the clergy. Certainly, the Emperor was a high dignitary in the Church, but in a very special sense, which it is not easy to define exactly. Whatever the original meaning of the rite of Imperial Coronation might have been—and it seems that originally it was definitely a strictly "secular" ceremony, in which even the Patriarch acted as a civil servant—gradually it developed into a sacred rite, a *sacramentale*, if not a regular "sacrament," especially since it was combined with the rite of "anointment," a distinctively ecclesiastical rite, conferred by the Church. The rites of Imperial Coronation convey a thoroughly "consecrational" conception of the "temporal power." Probably, this "theocratical" emphasis was even stronger in the West than in Byzantium. It is specifically significant that the rite included a solemn oath to obey faithfully all rules of the Church, and above all to keep inviolate the Orthodox faith, in conformity with the Holy Scripture and the ordinances of the Councils.

The crux of the problem is in the claim of the "temporal" rulers, and in their endeavor, "to be Christian" and to perform accordingly certain Christian duties in their own right, as their own assignment. This claim implied a conviction that basically "the secular" itself was, in a certain sense, "sacred." In a Christian society nothing can be simply "secular." It may be argued that this claim was often insincere, no more than a disguise for worldly motives and concerns. Yet it is obvious that in many instances—and one should emphasize, in all major and crucial instances—this claim was utterly sincere. Both Justinian and Charlemagne—to quote but the most spectacular cases—were deeply sincere in

their endeavor to be "Christian rulers" and to promote the cause of Christ, as much as their actual policies were open to criticism. It was commonly conceded that the Emperor's duty was "to defend" the Faith and the Church, by all available means at his disposal, including even "the sword," but probably first of all by appropriate legislation. A tension would arise every time that Emperors displayed their concern for matters religious, as many Byzantine Emperors, and most of all Justinian, actually did on many occasions. In principle, this was not beyond their lawful competence. Neither "the purity of the Faith," nor "the strictness of the Canons," is a purely "clerical concern." Emperors should care for the "right belief" of the people. Nor could they be prohibited from holding theological convictions. If the right of formal decision in the matters of faith and discipline belonged to the Priesthood—and this right was never contested or abrogated—the right of being concerned about doctrinal issues could never be denied even to laymen, nor the right to voice their religious convictions, especially in the periods of doctrinal strife or confusion. Obviously, Emperors could raise their voice more powerfully and impressively than anybody else, and use their "power" (*potestas*) in order to enforce those convictions which they might, in full honesty, believe to be Orthodox. Yet even in this case Emperors would have to act through appropriate channels. They would have to impose their will, or their mind, upon the hierarchy of the Church, which they actually attempted to do more than once, using sometimes violence, threat, and other objectionable methods. The legal or canonical form had to be observed in any case. To act in religious matters without the consent and concurrence of the Priesthood was obviously *ultra vires* of the Imperial power, beyond its lawful

competence. Flagrant abuses by Byzantine Caesars should not be ignored. On the other hand, it is obvious that in no case were Emperors successful when they attempted to go against the Faith of the Church. The Church in Byzantium was strong enough to resist the Imperial pressure. Emperors failed to impose upon the Church a compromise with the Arians, a premature reconciliation with the Monophysites, Iconoclasm, and, at a later date, an ambiguous "reunion" with Rome:

"Nothing could be more false than the charge of Caesaropapism which is generally brought against the Byzantine Church—the accusation that the Church rendered servile obedience to the orders of the Emperor even in the religious sphere. It is true that the Emperor always concerned himself with ecclesiastical affairs; he endeavored to maintain or to impose unity in dogma, but his claims were by no means always submissively recognized. Indeed, the Byzantines became accustomed to the idea that organized opposition to the Imperial will in religious matters was normal and legitimate. . . . Without any suspicion of paradox the religious history of Byzantium could be represented as a conflict between the Church and the State, a conflict from which the Church emerged unquestionably the victor" (Henry Grégoire).

It can be argued that, in the course of time, the actual influence and the prestige of the Church in Byzantium were steadily growing. In this connection, the *Epanagoge*, a constitutional document of the late ninth century, is especially significant and instructive. It was apparently no more than a draft, which has never been officially promulgated. The draft was prepared probably by Photius, the famous Patriarch. Certain portions of the document were incorporated in the later legal compilations and received wide circulation. In any case, the document reflected the cur-

rent conception of the normal relationship between the Emperor and the hierarchy, prevailing at that time. The main principle was still the same as in Justinian. But now it was elaborated with greater emphasis and precision.

The Commonwealth, *politeia*, is composed of several parts and members. Of these the most important, and the most necessary, are the Emperor and the Patriarch. There is an obvious parallelism between the two powers. The peace and prosperity of the people depend upon the accord and unanimity between the Imperial power and the Priesthood. The Emperor is the supreme ruler, yet the purpose of the Imperial rule is Beneficence, *euergesia*. It is an old idea, inherited from Hellenistic political philosophy. In his rule the Emperor must enforce justice. The Emperor must be well instructed in the doctrines of faith and piety. He must defend and promote the teachings of the Scripture and of the Councils. His main task is to secure peace and happiness for the soul and the body of his subjects. The place of the Patriarch is no less exalted. "*The Patriarch is a living and animate image of Christ.*" In all his words and deeds he must exhibit truth. He must be crucified to the world, and live in Christ. To the infidel he must appeal by the holiness of his life. In the believers he must strengthen piety and honesty of life. He must endeavor to bring back the heretics into the fold of the true Church. He must be just and impartial to all men. Before the Emperors he must speak without shame in the defense of the right faith. To the Patriarch alone is given the authority to interpret the rules of the Fathers, and to rule about their lawful application.

Of course, this was an idealized picture. The actual reality was much darker and more ambiguous. The Emperors were always able to influence the elec-

tion of the Patriarchs and to arrange, by various devices, for the deposition of the unsuitable occupants of the throne. On the other hand, the Patriarchs also had ample resources in their eventual resistance to the imperial power, of which suspension and excommunication were not the least significant. Nevertheless, the ideal pattern, as depicted in the *Epanagoge* and elsewhere, has never been forgotten. "The really significant theory was that of the *Epanagoge*: Patriarch and Emperor, as allies not rivals, both essential for the prosperity of the East Roman polity—both parts of a single organism" (Norman H. Baynes).

The theory of a "dual government" in the single Commonwealth was commonly accepted in the Middle Ages, both in the East and in the West. The theory had various and divergent versions. It was the common background of both competing parties in the West, the Curialist and the Imperialist, the Papacy and the Holy Empire. The Church has been victorious in her struggle with the Empire in the West. But it was a precarious victory. The meaning of Canossa was ambiguous. The theocratic claims of the Empire were defeated. But, in the long run, this only led to the acute "secularization" of the temporal power in Western Society. A purely "secular" Society emerged, for the first time in Christian history. Accordingly, the "spiritual" Society, the Church, has been thoroughly "clericalized." Tensions did not diminish, nor were they calmed or tamed. But the "theocratic" mission of the Church was sorely reduced and compromised. The Unity of the Christian Commonwealth was broken. In the East, the Church won no spectacular victories over the Empire. The impact of the Imperial power on Ecclesiastical affairs has been ponderous, and often detrimental. Yet, in spite of all imperial abuses and failures, the Byzantine Commonwealth

retained to the very end its Christian and "consecrational" character. Religion and polity were never divorced or separated from each other. Byzantium collapsed as a Christian Kingdom, under the burden of its tremendous claims.

IV

MONASTICISM WAS, to a great extent, an attempt to evade the Imperial problem. The period of the bitter struggle between the Church and the Empire, under the Arianizing Caesars of the fourth century, was also the period of Monastic expansion. It was a kind of a new and impressive "Exodus." And the Empire always regarded this "Exodus," the flight into the Desert, as a threat to its very existence, from the times of St. Athanasius to the cruel persecution of monks by the Iconoclastic Emperors. It is often suggested that people were leaving "the world" simply to escape the burden of social life, with its duties and labors. It is difficult to see in what sense life in the wilderness could be "easy" and "leisurely." It was, indeed, a strenuous life, with its own burdens and dangers. It is true that in the West at that time the Roman order was falling to pieces, was sorely endangered, and partly destroyed by barbarian invasions, and apocalyptic fears and apprehensions might have crept into many hearts, an expectation of an imminent end of history. Yet, we do not find many traces of this apocalyptic dread in the writings of the Desert Fathers. Their motives for desertion were quite different. In the East, where the Monastic Movement originated, the Christian Empire was in the process of growth. In spite of all its ambiguities and shortcomings, it was still an impressive sight. After so many decades of suffering and persecution, "this World" seemed to have been opened for the Christian conquest. The

prospect of success was rather bright. Those who fled into the wilderness did not share these expectations. They had no trust in the "christened Empire." They rather distrusted the whole scheme altogether. They were leaving the earthly Kingdom, as much as it might have been actually "christened," in order to build the true Kingdom of Christ in the new land of promise, "outside the gates," in the Desert. They fled not so much from the world's disasters, as from the "worldly cares," from the involvement with the world, even under the banner of Christ, from the prosperity and wrong security of the world.

Nor was the Monastic endeavor a search for "extraordinary" or "supererogatory" deeds and exploits. The main ascetical emphasis, at least at the early stage of development, was not on taking "special" or "exceptional" vows, but rather on accomplishing those common and essential vows, which every Christian had to take at his baptism. Monasticism meant first of all a "renunciation," a total renunciation of "this world," with all its lust and pomp. And all Christians were bound to renounce "the world" and to pledge an undivided loyalty to the only Lord, Christ Jesus. Indeed, every Christian was actually taking this oath of undivided allegiance at this Christian initiation. It is highly significant that the rite of Monastic profession, when it was finally established, was made precisely on the pattern of the baptismal rite, and the Monastic profession came to be regarded as a kind of "second baptism." If there was a search for "perfection" in the Monastic endeavor, "perfection" itself was not regarded as something "peculiar" and optional, but rather as a normal and obligatory way of life. If it was a "rigorism," this rigorism could claim for itself the authority of the Gospel.

It is also significant that, from the

very beginning, the main emphasis in the Monastic oath was placed precisely on "social" renunciation. The novice had to disown the world, to become a stranger and pilgrim, a foreigner in the world, in all earthly cities, just as the Church herself was but a "stranger" in the earthly City, *paroikousa* on earth. Obviously, this was but a confirmation of the common baptismal vows. Indeed, all Christians were supposed to disown the world, and to dwell in this world as strangers. This did not necessarily imply a contempt for the world. The precept could also be construed as a call to its reform and salvation. St. Basil the Great, the first legislator of Eastern Monasticism, was desperately concerned with the problem of social reconstruction. He watched with grave apprehension the process of social disintegration, which was so conspicuously advanced in his time. His call to the formation of monastic communities was, in effect, an attempt to rekindle the spirit of mutuality in a world which seemed to have lost any force of cohesion and any sense of social responsibility. Now, Christians had to set a model for the new society, in order to counterbalance the disruptive tendencies of the age. St. Basil was strong in his conviction that man was essentially a social or "political" being, not a solitary one—*zoon koinonikon*. He could have learned this both from the Scriptures and from Aristotle. But the present society was built on a wrong foundation. Consequently, one had first of all to retire or withdraw from it. According to St. Basil, a monk had to be "home-less" in the world, *aoikos*, his only home being the Church. He had to go out, or to be taken out, of all existing social structures—family, city, Empire. He had to disown all orders of the world, to sever all social ties and commitments. He had to start afresh. The later custom or rule to change the

name in taking the habit was a spectacular symbol of this radical break with the previous life. But monks leave the society of this world in order to join another society, or rather to actualize in full their membership in another community, which is the Church. The prevailing form of Monasticism was "coenobitical," the life in common. The solitary life might be praised as an exception for a few peculiar persons, but it was firmly discouraged as a common rule. The main emphasis was on obedience, on the submission of will. "Community" was always regarded as a normal and more adequate manner of ascetical life. A monastery was a corporation, "a body," a small Church. Even hermits usually did dwell together, in special colonies, under the direction of a common spiritual leader or guide. This communal character of Monasticism was strongly reemphasized by St. Theodore of Studium, the great reformer of Byzantine Monasticism (759–826). St. Theodore insisted that there was no commandment of solitary life in the Gospel. Our Lord Himself lived in a "community" with His disciples. Christians are not independent individuals, but brethren, members of the Body of Christ. Moreover, only in community could Christian virtues of charity and obedience be properly developed and exercised.

Thus, monks were leaving the world in order to build, on the virginal soil of the Desert, a New Society, to organize there, on the Evangelical pattern, the true Christian Community. Early Monasticism was not an ecclesiastical institution. It was precisely a spontaneous movement, a drive. And it was distinctively a *lay movement*. The taking of Holy Orders was definitely discouraged, except by order of the superiors, and even abbots were often laymen. In early times, secular priests from the vicinity

were invited to conduct services for the community, or else the neighboring Church was attended on Sundays. The monastic state was clearly distinguished from the clerical. "Priesthood" was a dignity and an authority, and as such was regarded as hardly compatible with the life of obedience and penitence, which was the core and the heart of monastic existence. Certain concessions were made, however, time and again, but rather reluctantly. On the whole, in the East Monasticism has preserved its lay character till the present day. In the communities of Mount Athos, this last remnant of the old monastic regime, only a few are in Holy Orders, and most do not seek them, as a rule. This is highly significant. Monasticism cut across the basic distinction between clergy and laity in the Church. It was a peculiar order in its own right.

Monasteries were at once worshipping communities and working teams. Monasticism created a special "theology of labor," even of manual labor in particular. Labor was by no means a secondary or subsidiary element of monastic life. It belonged to its very essence. "Idleness" was regarded as a primary and grievous vice, spiritually destructive. Man was created for work. But work should not be selfish. One had to work for common purpose and benefit, and especially to be able to help the needy. As St. Basil stated it, "in labor the purpose set before everyone, is the support of the needy, not one's own necessity" (*Regulae fusius tractatae*, 42). Labor was to be, as it were, an expression of social solidarity, as well as a basis of social service and charity. From St. Basil this principle was taken over by St. Benedict. But already St. Pachomius, the first promoter of coenobitical Monasticism in Egypt, was preaching "the Gospel of continued work" (to use the able phrase of the late Bishop Kenneth Kirk). His

coenobium at Tabennisi was at once a settlement, a college, and a working community, in principle a "non-acquisitive society." One of the main monastic vows was the complete denial of all possessions, not only a promise of poverty. There was no room whatsoever for any kind of "private property" in the life of a coenobitical monk. And this rule was sometimes enforced with rigidity. Monks should not have even private desires. The spirit of "ownership" was strongly repudiated as an ultimate seed of corruption in human life. St. John Chrysostom regarded "private property" as the root of all social ills. The cold distinction between "mine" and "thine" was, in his opinion, quite incompatible with the pattern of loving brotherhood, set forth in the Gospel. He could have added at this point also the authority of Cicero: *nulla autem privata natura*. Indeed, for St. John, "property" was man's wicked invention, not of God's design. He was prepared to force upon the whole world the rigid monastic discipline of "non-possession" and obedience, for the sake of the world's relief. In his opinion, separate monasteries should exist now, in order that one day the whole world might become like a monastery.

As it has been well said recently, "Monasticism was an instinctive reaction of the Christian spirit against that fallacious reconciliation with the present age which the conversion of the Empire might seem to have justified" (Père Louis Bouyer). It was a vigorous reminder of the radical "otherworldliness" of the Christian Church. It was also a mighty challenge to the Christian Empire, then in the process of construction. This challenge could not go without a rejoinder. The Emperors, and especially Justinian, made a desperate effort to integrate the Monastic Movement into the general structure of their Christian

Empire. Considerable concessions had to be made. Monasteries, as a rule, were exempt from taxation and granted various immunities. In practice, these privileges only led ultimately to an acute secularization of Monasticism. But originally they meant a recognition, quite unwillingly granted, of a certain Monastic "extra-territoriality." On the other hand, many monasteries were canonically exempt from the jurisdiction of the local bishops. During the Iconoclastic controversy, the independence of Monasticism was conspicuously manifested in Byzantium. Up to the end of Byzantium, Monasticism continued as a peculiar social order, in perpetual tension and competition with the Empire.

Obviously, actual Monasticism was never up to its own principles and claims. But its historical significance lies precisely in its principles. Whereas in the pagan Empire the Church herself was a kind of "Resistance Movement," *Monasticism was a permanent "Resistance Movement" in the Christian Society.*

V

IN THE NEW TESTAMENT the word "Church," *ekklesia*, has been used in two different senses. On the one hand, it denoted the One Church, the Church Catholic and Universal, the one great Community of all believers, united "in Christ." It was a theological and dogmatic use of the term. On the other hand, the term, used in the plural, denoted local Christian Communities, or Christian congregations in particular places. It was a descriptive use of the word. Each local community, or Church, was in a sense self-sufficient and independent. It was the basic unit or element of the whole ecclesiastical structure. It was precisely *the Church in a particular locality, the Church "peregrinating," paroikousa*, in this or that particular city. It had, within itself, the

fullness of the sacramental life. It had its own ministry. It can be asserted with great assurance that in the early second century, at least, each local community was headed by its own Bishop, *episcopos*. He was the main, and probably exclusive, minister of all sacraments in his Church, for his flock. His rights in his own community were commonly recognized, and the equality of all local Bishops was acknowledged. This is still the basic principle of the Catholic canon law. The unity of all local communities was also commonly acknowledged, as an article of faith. All local Churches, as scattered and dispersed as they actually were in the world, like islands in a stormy sea, were essentially One Church Catholic, *mia ekklesia catholike*. It was, first of all, the "unity of faith" and the "unity of sacraments," testified by mutual acknowledgement and recognition, in the bonds of love. Local communities were in frequent contact, according to the circumstances. The Oneness of the Church was strongly felt in this primitive period, and was formally professed in manifold ways: "One Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of all" (Ephes. 4: 5,6). The external organization was loose. In the early years of the Church, contacts were maintained by travels and supervision of the Apostles. In the post-apostolic age they were maintained by occasional visits of the Bishops, by correspondence, and in other similar ways. By the end of the second century, under the pressure of common concerns, the custom of having "Synods," that is, the gatherings of Bishops, developed. But "Synods," that is, councils, were still but occasional meetings, except probably for North Africa, for a special purpose, and in a restricted area. They had not yet developed into a permanent institution. Only in the third century did the process of consolidation advance, and lead to

the formation of "ecclesiastical provinces," in which several local Churches in a particular area were coordinated, under the presidency of the Bishop in the capital of the province. The emerging organizations seem to have followed the administrative divisions of the Empire, which was practically the only natural procedure. The local "autonomy" was still firmly preserved and safeguarded. The chief Bishop of the province, the Metropolitan, was no more than a president of the episcopal body of the province and chairman of the synods, and had some executive authority and a right of supervision only in behalf of all Bishops. He was not authorized to interfere with the regular administration of particular local episcopal districts, which came to be known as "dioceses." Although in principle the equality of all Bishops has been strongly maintained, certain particular sees came to prominence: Rome, Alexandria, Antioch, Ephesus, to mention but the most important.

The new situation obtained in the fourth century. On the one hand, it was a century of Synods. Most of these Synods, or Councils, were extraordinary meetings, convened for particular purposes, to discuss some urgent matters of common concern. Most of these Councils dealt with the matters of faith and doctrine. The aim was to achieve unanimity and agreement on principal points, and to enforce a certain measure of uniformity in order and administration. On the other hand, the Church had now to face a new problem. The tacit assumption of the basic identity between the Church and the Empire demanded a further development of administrative pattern. The provincial system, already in existence, was formally accepted and enforced. And a further centralization was envisaged. As the Commonwealth was one and indivisible,

a certain parallelism had to be established between the organization of the Empire and the administrative structure of the Church. Gradually, a theory of five Patriarchates, a *pentarchy*, was promoted. Five principal episcopal sees were suggested, as centers of administrative centralization: Rome, Constantinople, Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem. An independent status was conceded to the Church of Cyprus, in consideration of its Apostolic origin and ancient glory. What was more important, the Synod system was formally enforced. The Council of Nicea ruled that Provincial Synods should be regularly held twice in the course of the year (Canon 5). According to the established custom, their competence included, first, all matters which might emerge in the province, and also appeals from the local congregations. It does not seem that the system worked well or smoothly. The Council of Chalcedon observed that Synods were not regularly held, which led to the neglect of important business and disorder, and reconfirmed the earlier rule (Canon 19). And still the system did not work. Justinian had to concede that Synods might meet but once each year (*Novel 137.4*). The Council in Trullo (691-692), which codified all earlier canonical legislation, also ruled that meetings should be held yearly, and the absentees should be brotherly admonished (Canon 8). And finally, the Second Council of Nicea confirmed that all Bishops of the province should meet yearly, to discuss "canonical and evangelical matters" and to deal with "questions" of canonical character. The aim of the system was obvious. It was an attempt to create a "higher" instance in administration, above the episcopal office, in order to achieve more uniformity and cohesion. Yet, the principle of episcopal authority in local communities was still firmly upheld. Only, by that time, a

Bishop was no longer the head of a single local community, but "a diocesan," that is, the head of a certain district, composed of several communities which were committed to the immediate charge of priests, or presbyters. Only acting Bishops, that is, those who were actually in office, had jurisdiction, and the authority to function as Bishops, although the retired Bishops were keeping their rank and honor. Nobody could be consecrated as a Bishop, or ordained as a priest, except to a definite "title," that is, for a particular flock. There was no ministry "at large."

The logic of the single Christian Commonwealth seemed to imply one further step. The Imperial power was centered in one Emperor. Was it not logical that the Priesthood, the Hierarchy, should also have one Head? This has been actually claimed, if for completely different reasons, by the Popes of Rome. The actual basis of the "Roman claims" was in the Primacy of St. Peter and in the Apostolic privileges of his See. But, in the context of the Commonwealth-idea, these claims were inevitably understood as claims for the Primacy of the Empire. The "primacy of honor" was readily conceded to the Bishop of Rome, with the emphasis on the fact that Rome was the ancient capital of the Empire. But now, with the transfer of the capital to the New City of Constantine, which had become a "New Rome," the privileges of the Bishop of Constantinople also had to be safeguarded. Accordingly, the Second Ecumenical Council (Constantinople 381) accorded to the Bishop of Constantinople "the privilege of honor," *ta presbeia tes times*, after the Bishop of Rome, with an open reference to the fact that "Constantinople was the New Rome" (Canon 3). This put the Bishop of Constantinople above that of Alexandria in the list of ecclesiastical precedence, to the great anger and offence of

the latter. In this connection it was strongly urged that this exaltation of the Constantinopolitan See violated the prerogatives of the "Apostolic Sees," that is, those founded by the Apostles, of which Alexandria was one of the most renowned, as the See of St. Mark. Nevertheless, the Council of Chalcedon reconfirmed the decision of 381. Privileges of Rome were grounded in that it was the Capital City. For the same reason it seemed to be fair that the See of the New Rome, the residence of the Emperor and of the Senate, should have similar privileges (Canon 28). This decision provoked violent indignation in Rome, and the 28th Canon of Chalcedon was repudiated by the Roman Church. It was inevitable, however, that the prestige and influence of the Constantinopolitan Bishop should grow. In the Christian Commonwealth it was but natural for the Bishop of the Imperial City to be in the center of the ecclesiastical administration. By the time of the Council of Chalcedon, there was in Constantinople, along with the Bishop, a consultative body of resident Bishops, *synodos endemousa*, acting as a kind of permanent "Council." It was also logical that, in the course of time, the Bishop of Constantinople should assume the title of an "Ecumenical Patriarch," whatever exact meaning might have been originally connected with the name. The first Bishop who actually assumed the title was John the Faster (582-593), and this again could not fail to provoke the protest from Rome. St. Gregory the Great, the Pope, accused the Patriarch of pride and arrogance. There was no personal arrogance—the Patriarch was a severe and humble ascetic, "the Faster"—there was but the logic of the Christian Empire. Political catastrophes in the East, that is, the Persian invasion and Arab conquest, together with the secession of Monophysites and Nestor-

ians in Syria and Egypt, reduced the role of the ancient great Sees in those areas, and this accelerated the rise of the Constantinopolitan See. At least *de facto*, the Patriarch had become the chief Bishop of the Church in the Eastern Empire. It is significant that the *Epanagoge* spoke plainly of the Patriarch, meaning of course the Patriarch of Constantinople. He was the opposite number to the Emperor. By that time the political unity of the Christian Commonwealth had been already broken. Byzantium had actually become precisely an Eastern Empire. And another, and rival, Empire had been founded in the West, under Charlemagne. After a period of indecision, the See of Rome finally took the side of Charlemagne. On the other hand, the missionary expansion among the Slavs in the ninth and tenth centuries greatly enlarged the area of the Constantinopolitan jurisdiction.

It is commonly admitted that "Roman Unity," the *Pax Romana*, facilitated the missionary expansion of the Church, which only in rare cases went beyond the boundaries of the Empire, the *limes Romanus*. It is also obvious that the empirical unity of the Church had been so speedily realized precisely because the Empire was one, at least in principle and in theory. Those countries which were outside of the Empire were also loosely fitted into the institutional unity of the Church. The factual identity of the main ecclesiastical organization with the Empire created considerable difficulty for those Churches which were beyond the Imperial border. The most conspicuous example is the Church in Persia, which was compelled to withdraw from the unity with the West already in 410 and constitute itself into an independent unit, precisely because the Church in the West was too closely connected with the Roman Empire, an enemy of Persia. The split was caused by non-theological fac-

tors, and was limited to the level of administration. Thus, "Roman Unity" was at once a great advantage and a handicap for the Church's mission.

Now, it can be reasonably contended that in the period before Constantine the Church did not evolve any organization which could have enabled her to act authoritatively on a really "ecumenical" scale. The first truly "ecumenical" action was the Council in Nicea, in 325, the *First Ecumenical Council*. Councils were already in the tradition of the Church. But Nicea was the first Council of the *whole Church*, and it became the pattern on which all subsequent Ecumenical Councils were held. For the first time the voice of the whole Church was heard. The membership of the Council, however, was hardly ecumenical, in the sense of actual representation. There were but four Bishops from the West, and the Roman Bishop was represented by two presbyters. Few missionary Bishops from the East were present. The majority of Bishops present came from Egypt, Syria, and Asia Minor. The same is true of all subsequent Ecumenical Councils, recognized in the Eastern Orthodox Church, up to the Second Council of Nicea, 787. Strangely enough, we do not find in our primary sources any regulations concerning the organization of the Ecumenical Councils. It does not seem that there were any fixed rules or patterns. In the canonical sources there is no single mention of the Ecumenical Council, as a permanent institution, which should be periodically convened, according to some authoritative scheme. The Ecumenical Councils were not an integral part of the Church's constitution, nor of her basic administrative structure. In this respect they differed substantially from those provincial and local Councils which were supposed to meet yearly, to transact current matters and to exercise

the function of unifying supervision. The authority of the Ecumenical Councils was high, ultimate, and binding. But Councils themselves were rather occasional and extraordinary gatherings. This explains why no Ecumenical Councils have been held since 787. In the East there was a widely spread conviction that no further Councils should be held, beyond the sacred number "Seven." There was no theory of the Ecumenical Councils in Eastern theology, or in the canon law of the East. Seven Councils were, as it were, the seven gifts of God, as there were seven gifts of the Spirit, or seven Sacraments. The ecumenical authority of those Seven Councils was of a "super-canonical" character. The Eastern Church, at least, did not know any "conciliar theory" of administration, except on a local level. Such a theory was elaborated in the West, in the late Middle Ages, during the so-called "Conciliar Movement" in the Western Church, in the struggle with the growing Papal centralization. It has no connection with the organization of the Ancient Church, especially in the East.

It is well known that Emperors were taking an active part in the Ecumenical Councils, and sometimes participated in the conciliar deliberations, as, for example, Constantine at Nicea. Councils were usually convened by Imperial decrees, and their decisions were confirmed by the Imperial approval, by which they were given the legally binding authority in the Empire. In certain cases, the initiative was taken by the Emperor, as it was with the Fifth Ecumenical Council, at Constantinople, 553, at which the pressure and violence of the Emperor, the great Justinian himself, was so conspicuous and distressing. These are the facts which are usually quoted as proof of the Byzantine Caesaropapism. Whatever influence the Emperors might have

had on the councils, and however real their pressure might have been, the Councils were definitely gatherings of Bishops, and only they had the authority to vote. The Imperial pressure was a fact, and not a right. The active role of the Emperors in the convocation of the Council, and their great concern in the matter, are completely understandable in the context of an indivisible Christian Commonwealth. It is obviously true that Ecumenical Councils were in a certain sense "Imperial Councils," *die Reichskonzilien*, the Councils of the Empire. But we should not forget that the Empire itself was an *Oikoumene*. If "ecumenical" meant just "Imperial," "Imperial" meant no less than "Universal." The Empire, by conviction, always acted in behalf of the whole of mankind, as gratuitous as this assumption might have been. Attempts have been made, by modern scholars, to construe the Ecumenical Councils as an Imperial institution, and, in particular, to draw a parallel between them and the Senate. This suggestion is hardly tenable. First of all, if the Senate was an institution, the Councils were just occasional events. Secondly, the Emperor's position at the Council was radically different from his position in the Senate. The vote belonged solely to the Bishops. Decisions were "acclaimed" in their name. The Emperor was an obedient son of the Church and was bound by the voice and will of the hierarchy. The number of Bishops present was, in a sense, irrelevant. They were expected to reveal the *common mind* of the Church, to testify to her "tradition." Moreover, decisions had to be unanimous: no majority vote was permissible in matters of eternal truth. If no unanimity could be achieved, the Council would be disrupted, and this disruption would reveal the existence of a schism in the Church. In any case, Bishops in the Council did not act

as officials of the Empire, but precisely as "Angels of the Church," by the authority of the Church, and by the inspiration of the Holy Spirit. Above all, as Edward Schwartz, the greatest modern authority on the history of the Councils, has aptly said, "the Emperor was a mortal, the Church was not."

VI

THE CHURCH is no tof this world, as her Lord, Christ, was also not of the world. But He was in this world, having "humbled" Himself to the condition of that world which He came to save and to redeem. The Church also had to pass through a process of the historical *kenosis*, in the exercise of her redemptive mission in the world. Her purpose was not only to redeem men out of this world, but also to redeem the world itself. In particular, since man was essentially a "social being," the Church had to wrestle with the task of the "redemption of society." She was herself a society, a new pattern of social relationship, in the unity of faith and in the bond of peace. The task proved to be exceedingly arduous and ambiguous. It would be idle to pretend that it has ever been completed.

The "Holy Empire" of the Middle Ages was an obvious failure, both in its Western and its Eastern forms. It was at once a utopia and a compromise. The "old world" was still continuing under the Christian guise. Yet it did not continue unchanged. The impact of the Christian faith was conspicuous and profound in all walks of life. The faith and the hope were impatient. People really did believe that "this world" could be "christened" and converted, not only that it was "forgiven." There was a firm belief in the possibility of an ultimate renewal of the entire historical existence. In this conviction all historical tasks

have been undertaken. There was always a double danger involved in the endeavor: to mistake partial achievements for ultimate ones, or to be satisfied with relative achievements, since the ultimate goal was not attainable. It is here that the spirit of compromise is rooted. On the whole, the only ultimate authority which has been commonly accepted at this time is that of the Christian truth, in whatever manner this truth might have been expounded and specified. The myth of "the dark Middle Ages" has been dispelled by an impartial study of the past. There has even been a shift in the opposite direction. Already Romantics have started preaching a "return" to the Middle Ages, precisely as an "Age of Faith." They are impressed by the *spiritual unity* of the Medieval world, in striking contrast with the "anarchy" and "confusion" of Modern times. Obviously, the Medieval world was also a "world of tensions." Yet, tensions seemed to be overarched by certain crucial convictions, or coordinated in the common obedience to the supreme authority of God. The sore shortcomings of the Medieval settlement should not be ignored or concealed. But the nobility of the task also should not be overlooked. The aim of the Medieval man was to build a truly Christian Society. The urgency of this aim has been recently rediscovered and recognized. Whatever may be said about the failures and abuses of the Medieval period, its guiding principle has been vindicated. The idea of a Christian Commonwealth is now again taken quite seriously, as much as it is still enveloped in fog and doubt, and in whatever particular manner it may be phrased in our own days. In this perspective, the Byzantine politico-ecclesiastical experiment also appears in a new light. It was an earnest attempt to solve a real problem. The experiment probably should not be reenacted, nor, in-

deed, can it be actually repeated in the changed situation. But lessons of the past should not be forgotten or unlearned. The Byzantine experiment was not just a "provincial," an "Eastern" experiment. It had an "ecumenical" significance. And much in the Western legacy is actually "Byzantine," both good and bad.

For obvious reasons, Monasticism could never become a common way of life. It could be, of necessity, but a way for the few, for the elect, for those who might have chosen it. An emphasis on the free decision was implied. One can be born into a Christian Society, one can be but re-born into Monasticism, by an act of choice. The impact of Monasticism was much wider than its own ranks, nor did the monks always abstain from a direct historical action, at least by the way of criticism and admonition. Monasticism was an attempt to *fulfil* the Christian obligation, to organize human life exclusively on a Christian basis, in opposition to "the world." The failures of historical Monasticism must be admitted and duly acknowledged. They were constantly exposed and denounced by the Monastic leaders themselves, and drastic reforms have been periodically undertaken. Monastic "degeneration" has been a favorite theme of many modern historians. And again, in recent times "the call of the Desert" has assumed a new urgency and thrill, not only attracting those who are tired of the world and are dreaming of "escape" or "refuge," but also awakening those who are zealous to enforce a "renewal" upon a world confused by fear and despair. Monasticism attracts now not only as a school of contemplation, but also as a school of obedience, as a social experiment, as an experiment in common life. Here lies the modern thrill of the cloister. In the context of this new experience, the legacy of the Eastern and By-

zantine Monasticism is being readily and gratefully received and reassessed by an increasing number of fervent Christians in the West and elsewhere.

The Church, which establishes herself in the world, is always exposed to the temptation of an excessive adjustment to the environment, to what is usually described as "worldliness." The Church which separates herself from the world, in feeling her own radical "otherworldliness," is exposed to an opposite danger, to the danger of excessive detachment. But there is also a third danger, which has probably been the major danger of Christian history. It is the danger of double standards. This danger has been precipitated by the rise of Monasticism. Monasticism was not meant originally to be just a way for the few. It was conceived rather as a consequent application of common and general Christian vows. It served as a powerful challenge and reminder in the midst of all historical compromises. Yet a worse compromise was invented, when Monasticism became reinterpreted as an exceptional way. Not only was the Christian Society sorely rent asunder and split into the groups of "religious" and "secular," but the Christian ideal itself was split in twain and, as it were, "polarized," by a subtle distinction between "essential" and "secondary," between "binding" and "optional," between "precept" and "advice." In fact, all Christian "precepts" are but calls and advice, to be embraced in free obedience, and all "advice" is binding. The spirit of compromise creeps into Christian action when the "second best" is formally permitted and even encouraged. This "compromise" may be practically unavoidable, but it should be frankly acknowledged as a compromise. A multiplicity of the manners of Christian living, of course, should be admitted. What should not be admitted is their

grading in the scale of "perfection." Indeed, "perfection" is not an advice, but a precept, which can never be dispensed with. One of the greatest merits of Byzantium was in that it could never admit in principle the duality of standards in Christian life.

Byzantium had failed, grievously failed, to establish an unambiguous and adequate relationship between the Church and the larger Commonwealth. It did not succeed in unlocking the gate of the Paradise Lost. Yet nobody else has succeeded, either. The gate is still

locked. The Byzantine key was not the right one. Neither were the other keys. And probably there is no earthly or historical key for that ultimate lock. There is only an eschatological key, the true "Key of David." Yet Byzantium was for centuries wrestling, with fervent commitment and dedication, with a real problem. And in our own days, when we are wrestling with the same problem, we may get some more light for ourselves through an impartial study of the Eastern experiment, both in its hope and in its failure.

**The crucial dilemmas of the nuclear age examined by
one of the great thinkers of our time**

THE STRUCTURE OF NATIONS AND EMPIRES

by Reinhold Niebuhr

Dr. Niebuhr, in his most important book, puts the precarious "balance of terror" which characterizes today's world into historical perspective. His analysis is compulsory reading for everyone concerned with the problems of nuclear power and politics. Dr. Will Herberg has termed it "a brilliant and profound orientation by one of the most creative thinkers of our time. . . . He achieves an insight and understanding given to few of our generation."

To be published August 26

\$5.00

One of the most significant philosophical works of our time

THE DEGREES OF KNOWLEDGE

by Jacques Maritain

A brilliant and approved translation into English of a book which has been described as "the outline, at least, of a synthesis of science, philosophy and theology which will do for us what St. Thomas did for philosophy in the middle ages." *With the full appendices of the original French edition.*

\$7.50

CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS



Copyright and Use:

As an ATLAS user, you may print, download, or send articles for individual use according to fair use as defined by U.S. and international copyright law and as otherwise authorized under your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement.

No content may be copied or emailed to multiple sites or publicly posted without the copyright holder(s)' express written permission. Any use, decompiling, reproduction, or distribution of this journal in excess of fair use provisions may be a violation of copyright law.

This journal is made available to you through the ATLAS collection with permission from the copyright holder(s). The copyright holder for an entire issue of a journal typically is the journal owner, who also may own the copyright in each article. However, for certain articles, the author of the article may maintain the copyright in the article. Please contact the copyright holder(s) to request permission to use an article or specific work for any use not covered by the fair use provisions of the copyright laws or covered by your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement. For information regarding the copyright holder(s), please refer to the copyright information in the journal, if available, or contact ATLA to request contact information for the copyright holder(s).

About ATLAS:

The ATLA Serials (ATLAS®) collection contains electronic versions of previously published religion and theology journals reproduced with permission. The ATLAS collection is owned and managed by the American Theological Library Association (ATLA) and received initial funding from Lilly Endowment Inc.

The design and final form of this electronic document is the property of the American Theological Library Association.

Dvornik cogently demonstrates that the Byzantines were much longer influenced by the principles of adaptation of the political administrative forms of the Roman Empire to ecclesiastical organization than were the Westerners, that this was indeed a principle of the early Christian Church and not an unusual innovation. East and West were early developing in different directions, using different arguments at different times.

It was later that Rome tried to counter the claims of Constantinople to apostolic foundations, thus reversing her own previous position. In Dvornik's own concluding words:

"In reflecting on this change of attitude on the part of the West toward Byzantine claims regarding the apostolic character of the *see* of Constantinople, it is a great temptation to conclude these considerations with the remark: *Difficile est saturam non scribere*. There is, however, nothing satirical in the history of this dispute. From beginning to end this argument over two principles of ecclesiastical organization — that of apostolicity and that of adaptation to the political organization of the Empire — was conducted earnestly and passionately. The lack of understanding of the first and the overemphasizing of the second on the part of the Byzantines induced the Romans to deny to Constantinople that second rank in Church organization which it rightfully claimed. Similarly, Rome was prevented from recognizing early enough the change in Byzantium that favored the apostolic principle in Church organization. Thus it was that this dispute contributed so considerably toward intensifying the misunderstanding between West and East; a misunderstanding that, together with other factors, led to the schism so fateful for the history of Christianity." (pp. 298-299)

This study of the role of the importance of apostolicity in East-West relations is a major contribution to historical and theological scholarship. The twenty-six page bibliography at the end of this volume adds to the extreme usefulness of this very important book.

JOHN E. REXINE

HANS VON CAMPENHAUSEN, *The Fathers of the Greek Church*.
Translated by Stanley Godman. New York: Pantheon Books, 1959.
Pp. 170. \$3.95.

There has been a crying need for a general book on the Greek Church Fathers uncluttered by ponderous notes and scholarly jargon but one which would give the English reader an opportunity to get a

general picture and estimate of some of the most important of the Greek Church Fathers. Pantheon Books has done the general reading public an excellent service by providing a thoroughly readable English translation by Stanley Godman of Hans von Campenhausen's German text, which was published in Stuttgart in 1955.

Justin, Irenaeus, Clement of Alexandria, Origen, Eusebius of Caesarea, Athanasius, Basil the Great, Gregory of Nazianzus, Gregory of Nyssa, Synesius of Cyrene, John Chrysostom, and Cyril of Alexandria, are represented each by a chapter. All are presented vividly and interestingly.

The avowed intentions of this work are historical and not apologetic. It was the idea of the author to present these writers and thinkers, all of whom wrote in Greek, in the light in which they saw themselves: their personalities, their intellectual aims and achievements within the proper context of their own times. Consequently, the approach here is not one limited to a kind of patristic literary history but an approach which clearly demonstrates that these men thought of themselves as exponents of divine truth, which it was their duty to preserve in the local churches and preach to the world in general. "They expressly rejected literary and academic ambitions — such at least were not their main interests in life. They thought of themselves as the authorized teachers of the Church, as Christian philosophers, as trained, enlightened interpreters of the Bible, which contains God's saving revelation." (p. 10) There is another comment from our author's introduction that is well worth quoting: "There can be no doubt that the combination of the Christian and classical inheritance which is the foundation of Western civilization was first created and established by the Fathers of the Church. They meditated on the problem contained in this double legacy and attempted to find a fundamental theological solution. They were not, however, concerned with the much-discussed problem of the adaptation and preservation of the classical tradition: they were concerned with the absolute truth which they found in the Bible and in the tradition of the Church." (p. 10) These words, I think, admirably provide a general frame of reference for the importance and achievement of the Fathers of the Church, the Greek Fathers in particular. Of course, only a small number of Fathers are included in this handy volume and even some of these are no longer acknowledged as Fathers but the book presents representative figures and their work. The Fathers are no longer self-appointed or God-appointed witnesses of Christian revelation; they assume the witnesses of an earlier, apostolic age. It was the express desire of these men to serve their Church as free, responsible human agents by the composition of

treatises and interpretations which were polemical and apologetic in nature, devotional, systematic or even historical in form.

These are the men who are represented by selection in this book. They speak for themselves through the author's reconstruction and evaluation of their achievement.

This volume is an excellent general introduction to what to most people is the arcane subject of patristics or patrology. No longer arcane, it now becomes vivid and fascinating in this tome.

JOHN E. REXINE

RAYMOND ETTELDORF, *The Catholic Church in the Middle East.*
New York: The Macmillan Company, 1959. Pp. 184, \$3.75.

This compact little volume reflects contemporary interest in all things pertaining to the Middle East, including the status of the Christian religion in this crucial area of the world. It is of no small importance that the author of this book is a "committed person," a Roman Catholic priest with a special interest in the so-called Oriental churches and one who himself traveled to the Middle East, making as strong an effort as possible to evaluate the current status and condition of the Roman Catholic Church in the Middle East. Where possible the author visited Catholic communities first hand and lived with Middle East Catholics for as long as time would permit. Consequently, it is no surprise that this book is primarily concerned with an evaluation of the Catholic situation in Jordan, Israel, Egypt, Syria, Lebanon, Iran, Iraq, and Turkey. In fact, these are titles of the first eight chapters of the book, whereas the ninth, entitled "The Middle East: Background of Ideas," attempts to summarize Communism in the Middle East, the ideological and real "walls of Islam," and Protestantism. Conspicuously missing is any detailed discussion of the tremendous role that the Eastern Orthodox played and continue to play in the Christian Middle East.

Msgr. Etteldorf has written a simple book with simple conclusions. Everywhere he visited in the Middle East he saw the Catholic faith strong (where it existed in any numbers), he saw (one almost might say naively) the possibility of more converts to Roman Catholicism if only there were somehow more native Catholic priests with more schools and more churches, and because Mohammedan law makes it extremely difficult (not to say dangerous) for a Moslem to become a Christian,



Copyright and Use:

As an ATLAS user, you may print, download, or send articles for individual use according to fair use as defined by U.S. and international copyright law and as otherwise authorized under your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement.

No content may be copied or emailed to multiple sites or publicly posted without the copyright holder(s)' express written permission. Any use, decompiling, reproduction, or distribution of this journal in excess of fair use provisions may be a violation of copyright law.

This journal is made available to you through the ATLAS collection with permission from the copyright holder(s). The copyright holder for an entire issue of a journal typically is the journal owner, who also may own the copyright in each article. However, for certain articles, the author of the article may maintain the copyright in the article. Please contact the copyright holder(s) to request permission to use an article or specific work for any use not covered by the fair use provisions of the copyright laws or covered by your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement. For information regarding the copyright holder(s), please refer to the copyright information in the journal, if available, or contact ATLA to request contact information for the copyright holder(s).

About ATLAS:

The ATLA Serials (ATLAS®) collection contains electronic versions of previously published religion and theology journals reproduced with permission. The ATLAS collection is owned and managed by the American Theological Library Association (ATLA) and received initial funding from Lilly Endowment Inc.

The design and final form of this electronic document is the property of the American Theological Library Association.

What the interested reader will get is a very general, historical description of the progress of the Greek Orthodox Church in this country from the founding of the first Greek Church in New Orleans, Louisiana, in 1866, to the present administration of His Eminence, Archbishop Iakovos. Because the survey is a general one, it is packed with the most general and presumably most significant facts and statistics about the evolution of the Greek Orthodox Church in the United States, and even though the author clearly admires the progress achieved thus far, he makes very few analytical statements about the history of the Greek Church in this country. He merely states the bare facts as he has collected them and as he sees them. As a book of facts and statistics about the history of the Greek Church in this country (with occasional references to South America), this book will be a handy reference guide and an invaluable source of information for all readers of the Orthodox Faith and for all those who are interested in the progress and history of the Greek Orthodox Church. Conspicuously lacking in this account of the past at any rate, is any indication of any efforts of the Greek Orthodox Church to acquaint itself with the other Orthodox Churches in the United States.

As was previously stated, no real value judgments are made in this book, no profound analyses, no attempts to evaluate the Greek Church in terms of its historical mission in this country. This does not mean that the author expresses no value judgments whatever. He is proud of the progress made thus far, but with the widening of the horizons of the Greek Orthodox Church in this country, he sees the necessity for a firmer financial base for the Archdiocese, the decentralization of the responsibilities of the Archbishop (by granting the local Bishops actual power to deal with local matters), the tightening of the real power and authority of the Archdiocese over communities and clergy, the improved training of clergy and laity in Archdiocesan institutions, and the betterment of overall administration.

With all these goals in sight, Mr. Kourides sees a bright future for the Greek Orthodox Church in America.

JOHN E. REXINE

LEROY WATERMAN, *Forerunners of Jesus*. New York: Philosophical Library, 1959. Pp. xii, 156.

Here is a book that will excite doctrinal opposition, but one which aims to establish for Jesus a higher moral teaching than has been

practiced by either Judaism or Christianity. Leroy Waterman, Professor Emeritus of Near Eastern Studies at the University of Michigan, sees two principal forerunners of Jesus, and these are the Great Unknown Prophet of the Jewish Exile of Isaiah 40-55 and John the Baptist, who is studied in terms of the Dead Sea Scrolls and is hypothesized to have been a member of the religious sect at Qumran, though an extraordinary member.

Professor Waterman sees both these men and an understanding of their teaching as indispensable for a clearer comprehension and appreciation of the teaching of Jesus. For Waterman these two set forth "the pattern and framework of a universal religion and some of the means whereby it can be achieved. John the Baptist by his courage and heroic devotion to moral principle provided the essential clue which could make available to Jesus the highest religious teaching in Israel's past. In the foregoing presentation they not only went before him but they clarify the where, when, how and why of his public career and explain the kind of message he brought. That discussion has endeavored to show that Jesus was the first person after Isaiah II fully to accept that prophet's concept of God and man and his ideas on how God and man are to be brought together, namely, by the servant function. It was also shown that Jesus by his life and death set a supreme example by that servant concept." (p. 134)

By the "servant concept" Waterman means the ability to stand for the highest truth, no matter what it costs, even life itself, because here is involved a higher truth, which is for the welfare of all men. Such was the sacrifice of Jesus.

Though Waterman does not broach the question of the divinity of Christ, it is obvious that his study, *Forerunners of Jesus*, centers on the man Jesus and his most important predecessors, and how he discovered and fulfilled a moral teaching that was higher than any moral teaching that has ever been devised. This book provides a provocative view of Jesus the man but doctrinally will be unacceptable for most Christians because it does not go beyond the human aspect of Jesus.

JOHN E. REXINE

JOHN LOWE, *Saint Peter*. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1956. Pp. 65. \$2.50.

This excellent little book by the Dean of Christ Church, Oxford, the Very Reverend John Lowe, presents in three chapters, a general



Copyright and Use:

As an ATLAS user, you may print, download, or send articles for individual use according to fair use as defined by U.S. and international copyright law and as otherwise authorized under your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement.

No content may be copied or emailed to multiple sites or publicly posted without the copyright holder(s)' express written permission. Any use, decompiling, reproduction, or distribution of this journal in excess of fair use provisions may be a violation of copyright law.

This journal is made available to you through the ATLAS collection with permission from the copyright holder(s). The copyright holder for an entire issue of a journal typically is the journal owner, who also may own the copyright in each article. However, for certain articles, the author of the article may maintain the copyright in the article. Please contact the copyright holder(s) to request permission to use an article or specific work for any use not covered by the fair use provisions of the copyright laws or covered by your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement. For information regarding the copyright holder(s), please refer to the copyright information in the journal, if available, or contact ATLA to request contact information for the copyright holder(s).

About ATLAS:

The ATLA Serials (ATLAS®) collection contains electronic versions of previously published religion and theology journals reproduced with permission. The ATLAS collection is owned and managed by the American Theological Library Association (ATLA) and received initial funding from Lilly Endowment Inc.

The design and final form of this electronic document is the property of the American Theological Library Association.

it places excessive emphasis on would-be primitive origins and not enough on the proper historical and religious significance of the symbolism on Jewish coins. For a man that acknowledges that the Jews have contributed two unique ideas to civilization, namely the Messianic idea and monotheism, Mandel narrowly confines himself to seeing all Jewish symbolism on coins through the eyes of the fertility cult.

The extensive appendices of this book (pp. 213-258, nine in all) include a genealogical table and a map of ancient Palestine, an article on the identification of the Temple Laver, a reprinted article on the authenticity of three shekel hoards from Jerusalem, a short article on the coins found at the time of the Dead Sea Scrolls discovery, an article on a coin of King Agrippa I, notes on fertility symbols, and a new classification key for the dating of ancient Jewish coins. There is also a brief bibliography.

This book has many challenging new ideas to offer, but it should be subjected to the closest scrutiny of numismatists, historians, and scholars before any of the views in it are to obtain wide prominence. Though many will categorically reject the views put forward, the authors have shown their determination to challenge traditional views on their subject, and if nothing else, they are calling the reader's attention to the need for constant re-examination of the historical and numismatic evidence in the light of the latest discoveries and are showing the inadequacies of many of the traditional views. This book deserves attention, if only to answer some of its challenges.

JOHN E. REXINE

ANDRE BONNARD, *Greek Civilization: From the Antigone to Socrates*. Translated by A. Lytton Sells. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1959. Pp. 248 and 32 illustrations.

This is the second volume of Professor Bonnard's work on Greek civilization, beautifully translated again by Professor A. Lytton Sells, and lavishly illustrated with 32 superb illustrations of Greek works of art and landscapes. About the general conception and principles of the book I wrote in this periodical (vol. IV, 1, pp. 78-82) when reviewing the first volume. However, the new material treated in this volume calls for some specific remarks.

In this volume Professor Bonnard examines some aspects of Greek civilization from the *Antigone* to the death of Socrates. The subjects examined do not cover, by any means, all the facets of Greek civilization in that period. Here again, as in the first volume, many important aspects of Greek civilization are either completely ignored or referred to hurriedly. Of course, every writer is the master of his material: he is to decide what to include or exclude from a book he is writing. However, when one writes a two-volume work about Greek civilization, one can hardly be justified in leaving unmentioned the creation of a personality of Euripides' magnitude or to refer *passim* only to the work of Thucydides. These and other omissions in this volume, added to those mentioned in my review of the first volume (fortunately, two of those subjects, namely, the Ionian philosophers and Pindar, are examined in this second volume), subtract much of the value of Professor Bonnard's work.

The book comprises the following ten chapters: I, The Promise of the *Antigone*; II, Marble and Bronze; III, The Birth of Science: the Explanation of the World: Thales and Democritus; IV, Sophocles and Oedipus: the Reply to Destiny; V, Pindar, Prince of Poets and Poet of Princes; VI, Herodotus as Explorer of the Old Continent; VII, The Position of Medical Science in the Fifth Century: Hippocrates; VIII, Aristophanes' Laughter; IX, The Declining Day; X, The Enigma of Socrates.

As we noticed in the first volume, Professor Bonnard is again at his best when he analyzes and evaluates aesthetically works of art, especially poetry. For instance, his analysis of the *Antigone* is vivid and his evaluation penetrating and profound, though one may disagree with some points of his interpretation of the play and the characters, particularly with some far-fetched sociological and political conclusions. The same is also true concerning his treatment of Pindar and Aristophanes: He shows their poetical powers well, with real appreciation and insight; yet, he somewhat does injustice to Pindar by misinterpreting the poet's religious beliefs and moral doctrines; and in Aristophanes' case, Professor Bonnard seems to overestimate the historicity of the "information" in his comedies by accepting as facts almost all of them. It is almost as if one does not permit any flight of imagination or, when it suits him, any distortion of events by a poet, a comedian especially. Of course, the poet usually takes his material from his environment, but he does not simply copy it: If he is a real, creative poet, he transubstantiates it, and by adding to it or subtracting from it, he presents something new and personal. This is true even for

the most realistic, but also the most imaginative poet of ancient Greece, Aristophanes.

Again, concerning Aristophanes, it seems greatly exaggerated to contend that his principal types are only ready-made comical types taken over from the "popular and improvised farces" presented with stereotyped masks. Aristophanes and the other comic poets could not create comedy from the meager and crude popular material only. The poet's personal ingenuity and creativeness and the free democratic practices were the main reasons for the growth of comedy.

Really refreshing is the chapter about Hippocrates and the position of medical science in the fifth century, because it deals with a rather neglected aspect of the Greek civilization during the "Golden Age." Usually overwhelmed by the excellence of Greek art and literature during that period, many people fail to notice that science also was then flourishing, particularly the science of medicine, the foundations of which were then firmly laid for all subsequent centuries. Professor Bonnard, closely following Louis Bourgey's *Observations et Expérience chez les Médecins de la Collection Hippocratique*, presents not only good examples of the vast and diverse medical work and research then going on, but also the methods used and the "philosophy" underlying that important human discipline.

The brilliant, flowery, style of the author, his penetrating insight into the cultural values of Ancient Greece, his subtle and sound appraisal of Greek literature and art, the new, personal, though controversial, perspective under which he examines Greek civilization, make this book pleasantly readable, fascinating and elucidating. It may be used as an excellent introduction to the Greek civilization. And although "this work was designed for the general reader" and not for the classical scholar, yet even the latter will certainly profit greatly from this perceptive, lively and stimulating study.

However, after finishing the book, one may ask whether Greek civilization is really terminated with Socrates, as Professor Bonnard seems to suggest. But, what about the Greek creation, if not of later periods, at least of the fourth century? Are not Plato and Aristotle, Demosthenes and Menander, Lysippos, Praxiteles and Scopas part and parcel of the ancient Greek world, and do not their works express a new and important facet of the Greek character? If this is a decline, many peoples would like to have such a glorious and productive "decline" even as the main representation of their national culture. For, it is true what Palamas said: "Such a sunset puts into shame even the daylight."



Copyright and Use:

As an ATLAS user, you may print, download, or send articles for individual use according to fair use as defined by U.S. and international copyright law and as otherwise authorized under your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement.

No content may be copied or emailed to multiple sites or publicly posted without the copyright holder(s)' express written permission. Any use, decompiling, reproduction, or distribution of this journal in excess of fair use provisions may be a violation of copyright law.

This journal is made available to you through the ATLAS collection with permission from the copyright holder(s). The copyright holder for an entire issue of a journal typically is the journal owner, who also may own the copyright in each article. However, for certain articles, the author of the article may maintain the copyright in the article. Please contact the copyright holder(s) to request permission to use an article or specific work for any use not covered by the fair use provisions of the copyright laws or covered by your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement. For information regarding the copyright holder(s), please refer to the copyright information in the journal, if available, or contact ATLA to request contact information for the copyright holder(s).

About ATLAS:

The ATLA Serials (ATLAS®) collection contains electronic versions of previously published religion and theology journals reproduced with permission. The ATLAS collection is owned and managed by the American Theological Library Association (ATLA) and received initial funding from Lilly Endowment Inc.

The design and final form of this electronic document is the property of the American Theological Library Association.

H. A. WOLFSON'S PHILOSOPHY OF THE CHURCH FATHERS*

By REV. JOHN S. ROMANIDES

This book of Dr. Wolfson is from many viewpoints a valuable contribution to the history of Christian theology, especially since it presents a sincere handling of Biblical and Patristic theological material by one who is not committed to the Christian religion in advance. This study may be appreciated by some and disturbing to others.

From a certain point of view it should be considered extremely valuable as a demonstration on the insufficiency of certain methods of dealing with Biblical and patristic material, although the author did not apparently have such a purpose in mind.

There are those Biblical scholars who consider the New Testament selectively trustworthy and in their critical work apply methods of interpretation commonly used in the fields of history, comparative religion and philosophy in an endeavor to get back behind the Biblical data to what they dogmatically imagine to be the historical facts. Paradoxically enough some of the most radical methodologies at times somehow manage to salvage the confessional sensitivities of the methodologists using them. In this respect Dr. Wolfson is more consistent. He generally uses current methods but refuses to play the role of magician. He searches for a doctrine of Trinity in the New Testament and early Christian literature and fails to find it. In view of the presuppositions of his method this is quite normal and to be expected and should be appreciated accordingly.

In this paper we propose to discuss Dr. Wolfson's treatment of the doctrine of the Trinity leaving his exposition of Christology, Gnosticism and Heresies for another time. In passing, however, one may remark that his section on Christology is very well done, especially in view of Dr. Wolfson's non-soteriological approach.

* *The Philosophy of the Church Fathers*, vol. I, Faith, Trinity, Incarnation (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1956) pp. 635.

Considering the general confusion concerning the epistemological or methodological question in Biblical criticism today, it was natural for Dr. Wolfson to ignore the prophetic and apostolic experience in dealing with the doctrines in question. The only alternative to the soteriological approach is, of course, to treat of Christian doctrine within the categories of philosophy and myth and thereby understand the apophasic character of the prophetic and apostolic experience in terms of concepts and myth. That Dr. Wolfson ignores this aspect of the Biblical and early Christian literature is clear from the fact that he does not deal with it. The very title of his book, *The Philosophy of the Church Fathers*, reveals the weakness of his approach.

If the Old and New Testament prophetic and soteriological experience is not a reality for the Biblical critic it is impossible for him to make a scientifically correct evaluation of his field of study. When the prophet or apostle claims that he has seen the glory of God the Biblical critic is immediately put into a difficult position, especially when he himself has never seen the glory of God and even has no suspicion of what this claim points to and yet cannot explain it because of its suprarational character. To see and discern the glory of God is an experience of prophets, apostles and saints and belongs to those who in Christ partake of the βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ. The saint who sees the glory or the βασιλεία of God is in reality from a purely scientific and historical point of view the only one in a position to interpret the experience of other saints. Whether the modern Biblical scholar agrees or not, the ordinary methodologies used in historical and philosophical investigations cannot apply to the suprarational dimension of the uncreated. The uncreated glory of God is not and cannot be an object of scientific research. It is known only to those who have the gift of the Spirit. The correct interpretation of Scripture belongs to those who have been incorporated into the same soteriological experience as those who wrote the Scriptures. Both Old and New Testaments deal with the revelation of the glory of God. For a Biblical critic not to have seen the glory of God simply means he does not know the very object of his study.

Herein, from the biased viewpoint of an Orthodox Christian, would lie the fundamental weakness of Dr. Wolfson's treatment of Biblical and patristic theology. In this respect the application of the interpretive principle of eschatological frustrations as a key to understanding doctrinal developments (e.g., A. Schweitzer, M. Werner), although also a forcing of the sources, is perhaps superior, simply because it attempts to account for primitive Christian doctrine in terms of a defi-

nite historical experience of expectation, frustration and transformation. Dr. Wolfson's portrayal of primitive Christians as adding gods to the originally One God of Israel and then trying to reconcile their polytheistic accretions with their original monotheism for no existential reasons whatever is a caricature and not at all justified by the sources.

I. THE BIBLICAL MATERIAL

A basic weakness of Dr. Wolfson's treatment of the New Testament lies in the fact that he fails to take seriously its unity with the Old Testament, especially its continuity with the prophetic experience. Because of this he misses certain fundamental interpretive principles which are absolutely indispensable for a proper evaluation of both the Biblical and patristic material.

When dealing with the New Testament one must always keep in mind that in the primitive Church it was never separated from the Old Testament which served as the basic catechetical book of instruction. Therefore, many images and words and even actions found in the New Testament can be interpreted only in the light of an Old Testament parallel. The subject of the Old Testament is the creative and salvatory acts of God among His people. The Hebrews never spoke of God in abstract philosophical terms and knew that there was no name or definition which can be applied to the divine nature. God in the Old Testament is known only in His acts or energies, never in His essence or nature. When reading scripture a Jew was exercising himself in the careful study of the mighty acts of God by which Israel's enemies were destroyed.

The subject matter of the New Testament is also the mighty acts of God. The divine essence is beyond the reach not only of human experience generally but of the prophets and apostles also. It is the glory and not the essence of God which is revealed in Christ. The Logos did not become flesh to reveal the divine nature but to destroy the works of the devil by bringing man back into permanent communion with the glory of God. In other words, the Son of God became man to destroy the rule of Satan by restoring man to communion of divine grace which is none other than the glory and ruling power ($\betaατικεία$) of God. This uncreated glory of God was revealed to the prophets and so the Old Testament is a witness to the proper acts of God which can belong to no creature. Only God has the power to create, sustain and resurrect His people by bestowing upon them the Spirit of life. From this Old Testament point of view it is not necessary to say that Christ is God in so many words when this is done much more convincingly by an

action, such as raising Lazarus from the dead, or creating eyes for a man born blind, or changing water into wine. It was the glory of God which was revealed to Moses and the prophets in the Old Testament and it is exactly this same glory which is revealed in Christ in the New Testament. Καὶ ἐφανέρωσε τὴν δόξαν αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐπίστευσαν εἰς αὐτὸν οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ (John 2, 11) or ταῦτα εἶπεν Ἡσαῖας ὅτι εἶδε τὴν δόξαν αὐτοῦ (John 12, 41). This simply means that as far as the New Testament writers are concerned δόξα of Christ is identical with the δόξα of God seen by the prophets in the Old Testament. The New Testament and the Fathers of the Church (at least in the East) believe that it was through the Logos that God revealed His uncreated glory to the prophets.

Of course, Dr. Wolfson would argue that this idea was borrowed by the Fourth Gospel from Philo. But one finds the exact same interpretation in St. Paul and in the Synoptic tradition, especially on the Mt. of Transfiguration. Christ promises that some of the apostles will see the βασιλείαν τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐληλυθίαν ἐν δυνάμει and this is fulfilled in the event of the transfiguration when the three pillars of the Church εἶδον τὴν δόξαν αὐτοῦ (Lk. 9, 32), or τὸν νὺν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐρχόμενον ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ αὐτοῦ (Mth. 16, 28), which is none other than the βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ (Mk. 9, 1; Lk. 9, 27). That it is the Son of God Who revealed the glory of God to the prophets is further indicated from the fact that Moses and Elijah are seen speaking to Christ, the Lord of Glory, Whose glory was revealed to them and is now being revealed. After they saw the δόξα or βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ, the νεφέλη φωτεινὴ descended upon them and (as in the case of Exodus 33, 9) ἵδον φωνὴ ἐκ τῆς νεφέλης λέγουσα· οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ νίος μου ὁ ἀγαπητός, ἐν φενδύσησα· ἀκούετε αὐτοῦ. (Mth. 17, 5).

From this it should be clear enough why St. Paul could say εἰ γὰρ ἔγνωσαν, οὐκ ἀν τὸν Κύριον τῆς δόξης ἐσταύρωσαν (I Cor. 2, 8). The Κύριος τῆς δόξης is certainly He through Whom God revealed His glory to Moses and the prophets. It is also within this context only that St. Paul's conversion on the road to Damascus makes sense. He saw the Lord of Glory and could not see ἀπὸ τῆς δόξης τοῦ φωτὸς ἐκείνου (Acts 22, 11). He knew immediately that he was struggling against Him Who appeared to Moses and hence his acute suffering because of the blindness of his fellow Jews. The Fourth Gospel states the case clearly: "How can ye believe, who receive glory one of another, and the glory that cometh from the only God ye seek not? Think not that I will accuse you to the Father: there is one that accuseth you, even Moses, on whom ye have set your hope. For if ye believed Moses, ye

would believe me; *for he wrote of me*. But if ye believe not his writings, how shall ye believe my words?" (John 5, 44-47).

From what has been said one would suspect that there is much more in the New Testament about the doctrine of the Trinity than Dr. Wolfson thinks. Of course one does not find there the Homoousios spelled out in so many words. However, one must bear in mind that Christ did not speak about Himself in theoretical rational terms. He simply revealed His uncreated glory and power and His disciples realized that they were confronted by the Lord of Glory Who appeared to Moses and the prophets. It was not Philo who shaped the faith of the Church, but it was Christ Who revealed the glory of God as His Own proper glory: Καὶ νῦν δόξασόν με σύ, Πάτερ, παρὰ σεαντῷ τῇ δόξῃ ἣ εἶχο πρὸ τοῦ τὸν κόσμον εἶναι παρὰ σοί (John 17, 5).

This distinction between the uncreated glory of God and creatures is a basic Biblical and patristic distinction without which the whole field under discussion becomes unintelligible. St. Paul clearly writes, «ἡλλαγάν τὴν δόξαν τοῦ ἀρχάρχου Θεοῦ ἐν ὅμοιώματι εἰκόνος φθαρτοῦ ἀνθρώπου . . .» (Rom. 1, 23). This uncreated glory of God is none other than the uncreated ruling power (βασιλεία, δύναμις, κράτος) of God and denotes the divine activities and energies of God revealed to the prophets and apostles. The most fundamental epistemological factor in Biblical and Greek Patristic theology (including such early writers as SS. Justin, Theophilus and Irenaeus) is that God is and can be known to man in His glory and power only and never in His essence. The divine essence is never the subject of speculation. The identity of essence in the Holy Trinity can be known only from the identity of δόξα, βασιλεία, κράτος, ἐνέργεια, etc. These are names not of God or the essence of God, but of the uncreated glory or energies of God. Even the name God is not a name of essence but denotes Him Who Acts. The uncreated glory of God is not a world of Platonic forms and therefore is completely beyond the conceptual powers of the human mind. The glory of God cannot be the subject of rational inquiry. It can be known only by the suprasentient and suprarational experience of prophets, apostles and saints to whom God chooses to reveal Himself. Philosophy has not only never come to a knowledge of the glory of God, but has never even discovered the distinction between Creator and creature.

The few observations made thus far raise the question of method in studying the Biblical and patristic sources. It seems that Dr. Wolfson shares the bias of many that Biblical and early Christian literature

presents us with a strong element of naïveté and superstitious confusion which allow one to pass the material off as requiring no special epistemological study. When this is done the only alternative left is to relegate the material to the usual categories of concepts, myth and historical accidents.

In this respect Dr. Wolfson examines the New Testament without any consideration of the structure and purpose of the writings therein contained and of their use in the primitive Church. Every writing is written with a purpose within a definite historical situation and must be understood accordingly. One cannot expect to find a developed doctrine of the Holy Trinity in a work not written for this purpose. To try to find depth theology in works intended for catechumens, for example, is like finding fault with a book on simple arithmetic because it does not contain trigonometrical formulas.

It is accepted by many biblical critics today that the synoptic gospels were never intended to be a "story of the life of Jesus," as Dr. Wolfson thinks (p. 155), but were shaped according to the catechetical methods of instruction of the primitive Church and can be understood only within this context. Since the New Testament deals with the saving Acts of God and nowhere pretends to philosophize about the divine essence, one should see in these writings a method of instruction intended to lead those being taught into a definite soteriological experience. In the synoptic gospels one sees a series of spiritual exercises calculated to free the mind and body from demonic oppression and to lead the catechumen to a spiritual condition whereby he is able to distinguish between the acts of creatures and demons and the uncreated acts or glory of God. It is only when one learns to distinguish between the creaturely acts of men and demons and the uncreated glory of God that one can learn to struggle against sin, recognize the will of God and come to a knowledge of the uncreated glory of the Incarnate Logos. Otherwise one would naturally confuse the acts of creatures with the glory of God and this confusion, according to St. Paul, is the source of idolatry. In the healing and saving acts of Christ some recognized the uncreated glory or energies of God, while others saw nothing but demonic power (Mth. 12, 25-37; Mk. 3, 23-30; Lk. 11, 17-23).

It is clear from the very structure of the four Gospels, and witnessed to by the catechetical and baptismal practices of ancient Christians, that liberation from slavery to demonic influence was an absolute prerequisite for initiation into the mysteries of the faith. Whether Biblical critics like it or not, ancient Christians sincerely believed that those not liberated from the clutches of the prince of sin and falsehood

could not be receptive of the Spirit of Love and Truth and that "no one can say Lord Jesus, except in the Holy Spirit" (I Cor. 12, 3). "For it is impossible," writes St. Basil, "for a man, if he has not been previously enlightened by the Spirit, to arrive at a consideration of the Son" (Ep. 38).

The very fact that God can be known in His energies and acts only, and then only by one who learns to distinguish the uncreated glory of God from the energies of creatures, and especially of the devil, automatically brings to the fore the pastoral character of Biblical and patristic theology. Learning the theology of the Church and fighting the devil are two aspects of the same reality. To know God in His energies, activity and glory presupposes a correct knowledge of the operations of creatures and especially of the devil. The defeat of satan is a prerequisite not only to a correct approach to the study of the divine names and activities, but even more important a necessary preliminary to seeing the glory of God, which experience transcends all biblical and conceptual knowledge. The Bible and the Fathers of the Church were very much concerned about correct doctrine because this meant a correct knowledge of the mighty acts of God whereby the kingdom of satan was and is being brought to an end and this was considered the only means by which one could learn to fight against sin and have any hope of salvation.

This approach to Christian doctrine is contained in the very structure of the New Testament and is repeated by the whole patristic tradition. St. Symeon the New Theologian expresses this thought clearly: "The Son and Logos of God did not become man to be believed in, or to be glorified, or that the Holy Trinity and Godhead should be theologized, but 'that he might destroy the works of the devil' (I John 3, 8; comp. Heb. 2, 14-15), and when the works of the devil are destroyed in those who believe in Him, then the mysteries of theology and of Orthodox dogma are entrusted to him. For if those who have not been liberated from the works of the devil by the manifestation of the Son and Logos of God . . . are forbidden to enter the temple of the Lord and pray to God, how much more are they forbidden to read and explain Holy Scriptures?" (Orat. 10, 3). That it is the "god of this age" who hinders man from coming to a knowledge of "the glory of God in the person of Jesus Christ" is stated without any reservation by St. Paul in II Cor. 4, 3-4. From this point of view the philosophical approach to Christian doctrine is extremely questionable.

The synoptic tradition together with the Old Testament represents the pre-baptismal instruction of the ancient Church while the fourth

Gospel tradition presents us with a post-baptismal type of initiation into a deeper insight of the mysteries of salvation. The synoptic tradition is dealing with the pre-baptismal concern with the methods and powers of satan and the means by which he is defeated and the fourth Gospel is a post-baptismal and post-resurreccional reflection upon the experience of unity with God through Christ and in the Spirit, which is nothing more than participation in the basileia and glory of God. It is clearly within such a context that one must examine the statements of ancient Christian writers concerning the various types of faith, and not relate everything, as Dr. Wolfson does, to Greek and Philonic categories (pp. 102-140).

This raises the question of whether Dr. Wolfson's division between simple faith and rational knowledge can be strictly applied to the writers in question, or is the whole question to be discussed rather in terms of the simple faith of Christians before baptism and the mystagogical faith of Christians after baptism.

In this respect Tertullian would be maintaining a sharp division between philosophy and the revealed teachings of faith, understanding faith to imply the whole of Christian experience and instruction, whereas Clement and Origen, taking the lead from the frequency of the words "gnosis" and "epignosis" in SS. Paul and John especially, would choose the way of impressing Christians and non-Christians alike with the idea that the Church also has her scientist-philosophers who are by no means inferior to those of the world. The idea of a class of Christian philosophers is not only inherent in the very structure of the New Testament message, but also an outgrowth of the need to meet the pagan charges that Christians are ignorant people, and with what else could these charges be met except by projecting as Christian philosophers those initiated and accomplished in the mysteries of faith and salvation?

Having these few facts concerning ancient catechism in mind it would be impossible to relate every ancient writer's division between simple faith and mystical faith to a division between faith based on simple acceptance and faith based on rational demonstration supported by secular philosophy. Nor is it possible to refer to Philo what is inherent in the very structure of the Gospel traditions and catechetical practices of ancient Christians.

Thus, for example, Origen's categories of πιστεύειν μόνον or εἰσαγόμενοι and πιστεύειν ἐγγνωκέναι or τέλειοι (pp. 106-107) are not in themselves to be understood as qualifications of Paul's warning against

philosophy, but principally as a fundamental distinction between catechumens and those initiated into the mysteries. Origen's distinction between those who are able only to treat of moral subjects and those who have knowledge of mysteries (p. 108) is also to be found in the very structure of the Four Gospels and again reflects the distinction between catechumens and baptized. In contrast to the Synoptic Gospels, the Gospel of John contains no moral precept prior to 12, 25 and then sums up the essence of the supramoral teachings of Jesus in the account of the Last Supper. Therefore this classification is not necessarily a later reflection of Philonic influence.

The unity of the Old and New Testaments is not only of a predictive nature, as we have already seen, but involves cosmological, anthropological, soteriological and eschatological considerations which contradict Dr. Wolfson's general approach and make questionable his constant emphasis on Philonic influences in the development of Christian dogma.

The most important sense in which the Old Testament is the basis of the New Testament is the fact that God Himself revealed to the prophets His uncreated glory and thereby the complete distinction between Creator and creature and between the acts of the Creator and the acts of creatures and the complete dependence of the creature upon the Creator and the complete independence of the Creator. Creation declares the uncreated glory of God. However, the glory of God is not a Platonic world of forms and therefore creation is not a poor copy of a perfect original, nor is it possible to conceptualize the uncreated glory of God by a system of *analogia entis* or *analogia fidei*. The will (or wills) of God by which all things exist is not a world of substantial forms. The prophetic vision is not an intellectual intuition of eternal essences. It is an unknowing which transcends knowledge because it is not concerned with scientific or philosophical truth, but with knowledge of the living God Who transcends all categories of reason. The cosmological and soteriological implications are clear. The reality of man and creatures generally is not something which belongs to a Platonic or even Aristotelian system of universal forms. Each creature is not a simple participation in a universal idea, but constitutes an individual reality because of the creative will of God. Between God and creation there is no system of universal forms on which everything depends for its determination. The fundamental unitary principle underlying both the Old and New Testaments is the fact that God is One, that He alone created the world and everything in it, that He alone sustains creation as the source of all existence and life, that He created man to live in this world and none other, that He is related to

the world really and directly as is manifested throughout the Old Testament and especially in the incarnation of the Logos. These basic Biblical principles imply the facts that salvation can come to man not by the escape of his soul to another realm of existence, but only by a real resurrection of both body and soul and that this salvation can be accomplished only by God Who is the source of life. It is over these issues that the great theological conflicts of Church history were waged.

On the basis of Dr. Wolfson's exposition of Philonic thought, it is obvious that, excepting the absolute distinction between the uncreated God and creation, Philo's cosmology, anthropology, soteriology and eschatology have nothing in common with the above mentioned biblical and patristic presuppositions. In Philo there is future life in terms of immortality of the soul but no resurrection of the body and reality is not properly an attribute of material creation but belongs to the created realm of forms contained in a created Logos of which this world is but a poor copy. God's use of the created Logos as an instrument for creating and governing the world (Philo, vol. 1, pp. 200-359) is a Philonic deviation from Old Testament piety which strongly rejected any such idea (see G. F. Moore, *Judaism*, vol. 1, pp. 380-381), and even believed that God governs the world, not by created means (natural laws), but by His own immediate activity. (*Ibid.*, vol. 1, pp. 375-376, 384).

Dr. Wolfson attempts to absolve Philo of Zeller's criticism that he needed intermediaries between God and the world because of his doctrine of the absolute simplicity of God (Philo, vol. I, pp. 282 ff.), but later contradicts himself by admitting that God, for Philo, being self-sufficient, can have no real relation to creation, for this would make him dependent on creation. (Vol. II. pp. 137-138). Here again is an obvious deviation from the Biblical and patristic understanding of God Who by His will and creative act brought Himself into a real relationship with creation.

Generally the use of the term Logos in itself proves nothing concerning the nature of the New Testament doctrine of God and His relation to creation. Even if this term were taken from Philo there is yet the question concerning content and meaning.

Nowhere in the Bible is it stated that the Logos or the proper Son of God was either created or created out of nothing or that there was a time when He did not exist. The term *πρωτότοκος* used by Paul is, as Dr. Wolfson believes, a reference to the origin of the existence of the pre-existent Son of God, but, however, must be studied from the

viewpoint of the terms γέννησις and ἀναγέννησις used for baptism. In this sense the Logos is both μονογενὴς and πρωτότοκος. He is μονογενὴς because He is only natural Son of God and πρωτότοκος in relation to those destined to be reborn and resurrected, thereby becoming gods and sons of God by grace. Πρωτότοκος is certainly not synonymous with the term μονογενὴς (John 1, 14, 18; 3, 16, 18). These points have been extensively treated by the Fathers of the Church and from a purely academic point of view should have been at least mentioned if not taken seriously into consideration. Instead Dr. Wolfson chose to derive the New Testament idea of a begotten Son from the realm of pagan myth (pp. 288 ff., 294), thereby ignoring the purely apophatic sense in which it is used in the New Testament and by the Fathers of the Orthodox tradition. Dr. Wolfson is of course generally correct in observing that the idea of God generating gods or things is foreign to Old Testament thought which distinguishes only between God the Creator and creatures. However, Dr. Wolfson forgets that the category of Creator-creature cannot apply to the relation of origin between God and the Logos because the Son of God is not a creature. It is unrealistic to expect the New Testament writers to describe the Son of God as created when they believe Him to be uncreated. Therefore, it should not appear strange that they used such words as Father, Son and generation to indicate essential relationship and identity of essence. A man who builds a house is not of the same nature as his work. A Son, however, is of the same nature and equal to his Father. "For this cause therefore the Jews sought the more to kill Him, because He not only brake the Sabbath, but also called God His proper [or own] Father, making Himself equal with God" (John 5, 18). The names Father and Son reveal nothing concerning the divine nature and are to be understood only apophatically as indicating but never explaining or defining in any way the sameness of essence which is known only by the identity of glory, energy and ruling power of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit.

This of course raises the question of the use of the divine names which Dr. Wolfson seems to have overlooked. To speak of God in anthropomorphic terms is not foreign to the Old Testament. All human language is derived from human experience and it is impossible to use non-conceptual words when speaking about God. The danger of language and concepts lies in taking these as real descriptions or definitions of the divine essence which in the language of both the Old and New Testaments is idolatry. ". . . we ought not to think that the divine is similar . . . to a graven thing of the art and thought of man." (Acts 1, 19). In this sense any concept mistaken for a definition of either the glory or essence of God is an idol. Between the

Creator and the creature there is no basis of comparison, there is no analogy of Being. The Biblical names of God are not names of the divine nature and indicate without describing or defining either the energies of God in relation to creation or the rank and relation of origin of the Divine Persons. Dr. Wolfson deals with this problem in regard to Philo (Philo, vol. II, pp. 94-164) and had he investigated carefully this same topic in the Christian tradition his efforts would have been rewarded. From both the Old and New Testament point of view the limitations of human concepts concerning God are surpassed only by an apophatic attitude to the divine mystery and faith in the prophetic and apostolic experience and message concerning the glory and will of God. The only possible knowledge that a person, who has not himself seen the glory of God, can have about God is that contained in the witness of the prophets, apostles and saints. From the apophatic viewpoint of the Old Testament concerning the unknowability of God the meaning of John 1, 18; II Cor. 2, 10, for example, is obvious. From the viewpoint of a philosophy which would reduce uncreated reality to the level of created reason these passages mean nothing.

The idea of a created Logos is not only nowhere to be found in the New Testament, but when used as an interpretive key would deprive the Gospels of all consistency and meaning. The Gospel of John begins as the book of Genesis, "In the beginning was the Word . . . and all things were made by Him and without Him was not anything made that was made. In him was life and the life was the light of the world" (John 1, 1-5). Here is a proclamation that the Logos shares with God the creative and life-giving power and glory which created and sustains all things that were made. Then "the Word was made flesh" (John 1, 14) and the creative and sustaining powers which He had by nature as Logos and Son of God He communicated to His human nature as Son of Man. Thus He called His flesh life-giving and declared, "I am the Life, the Light, the Truth, the Way, the Resurrection, etc." In the Fourth Gospel Jesus declares, "Marvel not at this, for the hour is coming in which all that are in the graves shall hear His voice, and shall come forth . . ." (5, 28-29). Some chapters later, "He cried with a loud voice, Lazarus, come forth. And he that was dead came forth" (11, 43-44). These passages can be understood only in their Old Testament setting. "O ye dry bones, hear the word of the Lord . . . Thus saith the Lord God, Behold, O my people, I will open your graves, and cause you to come up out of your graves, and bring you into the land of Israel and ye shall know that I am the Lord when I have opened your graves, O my people, and brought you up out of your graves, and shall put my Spirit in you, and ye shall live, and I

shall place you in your own land. Then shall ye know that I the Lord have spoken it, and performed it, saith the Lord" (Ezek. 37, 4-14). According to the Gospel of John, it was because of the resurrection of Lazarus that Jesus was accorded by many a triumphal entry into Jerusalem (12, 18).

It is only within the Old Testament frame of presuppositions concerning the divine powers of creating and vivifying that one can make sense of such statements as, "I told you and ye believed not. The works that I do in my Father's name, they bear witness of me" (10,25). "If I do not the works of my Father, believe me not. But if I do, though ye believe not me, believe the works, that ye may know and believe that the Father is in me and I in Him" (10, 37-38). Certainly such language, regarded in its Old Testament setting, is vigorously pointing to a definite and unambiguous doctrine concerning the nature of the Incarnate Logos. Regardless of whether or not one accepts the teachings of the Fourth Gospel, the Gospel itself is quite clear. "My Lord and my God" (20, 29). Dr. Wolfson writes that "this exclamation may have been addressed by Thomas not to Jesus but to God" (p. 181). But this distinction between God and Jesus is Dr. Wolfson's misunderstanding of St. John's Gospel wherein it is clearly stated "the Logos was God" (1, 1) "and the Logos was made flesh" (1, 14).

Dr. Wolfson's arguments for an identification of the pre-existent Christ of Paul or the Logos of John with the Holy Spirit is open to serious questioning. For the present we may mention that he fails to consider the fact that nowhere does Paul express the intention of giving an exposition of the Christian doctrine of God. His references to the Trinitarian faith are of an indirect nature and therefore may not be manipulated as though they were intentionally written to meet the doctrinal requirements of a systematic theology. Nevertheless, St. Paul does make statements which indicate a Trinitarian understanding of God. Dr. Wolfson takes this into account, but, as we shall see, forces this material into his own frame of references.

Very peculiar is Dr. Wolfson's refusal to take seriously the Fourth Gospel's differentiation between the Incarnate Logos and the «ἄλλον Παράκλητον . . . even the Spirit of Truth, whom the world cannot receive" (14, 16-17). Concerning such obvious indications of a real distinction between the Logos and the Spirit Dr. Wolfson concludes, "Still there is no definite statement that it [the Holy Spirit] was distinct from the Logos" (p. 181). In this respect it is significant that Harnack deals with the anti-Montanist Alogoi, attacked by Hippolytus and mentioned by Epiphanius, who rejected the Fourth Gospel, not

only because of its Logos doctrine, but also because of its teaching concerning the Paraclete. (*History of Dogma*, Eng. Trans. London, 1897, vol. 3, pp. 14 ff.).

II. THE PATRISTIC MATERIAL

In Chapter XI Dr. Wolfson leaves the realm of the New Testament, carrying with him his "Logos equals Holy Spirit" conclusions and attempts to demonstrate that this was the faith of the first Christian writers until the Apologists began, under the literary influence of Philo (pp. 232 ff.), to distinguish the Logos from the Holy Spirit (pp. 191 ff.), thereby laying the foundations of the later Trinitarian doctrine.

He presents St. Ignatius of Antioch as his first example and claims, "It is quite clear that to Ignatius, as in the New Testament, the three members of the Trinity were not the Father and the preexistent Logos and the Holy Spirit, but rather the Father and the Holy Spirit and Jesus . . ." (p. 184) He quotes the Ignatian formula "in Son and Father and in Spirit" (Mag. VI, 1) and passes off the term Son as a reference to the "Incarnate Christ" (p. 184), which, according to his own definition of terms, means that the "Incarnate Christ" is not the pre-existent Son or Logos, but only the man Jesus. Elsewhere he contends that for Ignatius the Logos is not necessarily eternal (p. 192).

Dr. Wolfson quotes the epistle to the Ephesians (18, 2) of Ignatius where it is said, "For our God, Jesus the Christ, was conceived in the womb by Mary according to the dispensation of God from the seed of David on the one hand, from the Holy Spirit on the other." This is a literal translation using the exact word order of the Greek text. Dr. Wolfson's word order tends to de-emphasize the fact that Ignatius is here saying that "Our God . . . was conceived in the womb by Mary" from or through the Holy Spirit. In this passage Jesus Christ our God is certainly not identical with the Holy Spirit. This same passage says that "Our God, Jesus the Christ, . . . was born and baptized that He may cleanse the water by the passion."

Dr. Wolfson also quotes Ephesians VIII, 2 of Ignatius, but only in part, "both flesh and Spirit, born and yet not born" (p. 186). This passage continues «ἐν σαρκὶ γενόμενος Θεός», which is a parallel to «καὶ ὁ λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο» of the Fourth Gospel and to «Θεός ἐφανερώθη ἐν σαρκὶ» (I Tim. 3, 16) of St. Paul. Elsewhere in the same epistle (1, 1) Ignatius speaks of a "rekindling in the Blood of God" (ἀναζωπυρόσατες ἐν αἵματι Θεοῦ). Also in 9, 3 of Ephesians Ignatius writes that "the

old kingdom [meaning death] was being destroyed Θεοῦ ἀνθρωπίνως φανερούμενον εἰς καινότητα ἀιδίου ζωῆς». For Ignatius only God can abolish death and it is for this reason that Eucharistic communion of the body and blood of Christ is a «φάρμακον ἀθανασίας ἀντίδοτος τοῦ μὴ ἀποθανεῖν» (Eph. 20, 2). The blood of Christ (Phil. pro.) is life-giving exactly because it is the "blood of God" (Eph. 1, 1).

In view of such passages one cannot help but feel that Dr. Wolfson's attempt to prove that the Son in the Trinitarian formulas of Ignatius is just a man Jesus is very far fetched.

Dr. Wolfson's interpretation of Clem. XXII, 1, is not called for by the text. Psalms of the Old Testament addressed to us by Christ "Himself through the Holy Spirit" prove exactly the opposite of Dr. Wolfson's contention. If Christ in this passage is not the pre-existent Son of God, but had His beginning only by His human birth how was it possible for Him to speak through the Holy Spirit in the Old Testament not yet being in existence?

Also the quotation, "Christ, the Lord who saved us, though He was originally spirit became flesh" of II Clem. 9, 5 (p. 188) does not prove Dr. Wolfson's point. In the Gospel of John Christ says, "God is Spirit" (4, 24). In this sense the Logos is also Spirit. It is in this sense also that Ignatius says that Christ is "both flesh and spirit, born and yet not born" (Eph. VII, 2). It is noteworthy that Dr. Wolfson lists Hippolytus among those who distinguish the Logos from the Holy Spirit (p. 234). Yet Hippolytus uses the term Spirit to describe the Logos. "What is begotten from Him [the Father], except the Spirit, that is, the Logos?" (*Contr. Haer. Noeti.* 16). The statement in the Epistle of Barnabas (VII, 3) that Jesus is "the vessel of the Spirit" is simply a statement of fact which has no bearing on Dr. Wolfson's argument one way or another.

The Shepherd of Hermas is the only text which may lend itself to Dr. Wolfson's argument for the identification of the Logos and the Holy Spirit. However, one must keep in mind that in the primitive Church it was considered as inspired scripture and read along with the other books of the New Testament and so cannot be considered apart. Such an ardent Trinitarian as St. Athanasius speaks of this work as "the most edifying book" (*De Incarn. Dei* 3). He also mentions that the Arians based at least one argument on the Shepherd. Yet, as is witnessed to by his letter 39 concerning the canonical and extra canonical books which should be read by Christians, written long after the Arian controversy had started, the Shepherd never lost its esteem in

the mind of the great Saint. This can only mean that Athanasius could see nothing heretical in this book. In his *De Decretis* 4 he quotes the Shepherd as an authority. Judging from the context in which Athanasius mentions the Arian use of the Shepherd in *De Decretis* 18 and verified beyond any doubt in the synodical epistle to the bishops of Africa (*Ad Afros* 5) it is clear that the Arian use of Hermas was restricted to the commandment in Mandate I to believe in One God "Who created and set all things in order and made them to exist out of nothing."

In this regard it is also noteworthy that the Trinitarian Irenaeus quotes the Shepherd as scripture. (*Contr. Haer.* IV, 20, 2; Eusebius, *Ch. Hist.* V, viii, 7). Then there is the fact that the Theodotians (190-218) of Rome held beliefs concerning God very similar to Dr. Wolfson's description of what he imagines to be a primitive identification of the Logos and Holy Spirit. In addition, the Theodotian Christology is almost identical with Dr. Wolfson's understanding of the Biblical doctrine of Christ, except that the Theodotians accepted the Virgin Birth as an original part of the Gospel message. (*Phil. of Ch. Fath.*, pp. 602-603). On the other hand we know that the Theodotians were opposed from the very beginning by the Orthodox Church in Rome at a time when the Shepherd was probably still read in Church and certainly quoted as scripture by St. Irenaeus. All this plus the fact that nowhere is it recorded that the Theodotians appealed to the Shepherd for support of their Logos equals Holy Spirit teachings seems to take the force out of Dr. Wolfson's use of the Shepherd. One would have to admit at least the possibility that both terms Holy and Spirit may be applied by the Shepherd to Christ in the sense that He is both Holy and God. As we have seen, others before and even after him had done the same.

Getting back to Paul for a moment, one notices that Dr. Wolfson uses two arguments (one from the Wisdom of Solomon and one from Paul himself referring to the spiritual rock from which the Jews drank in the desert, I Cor. 10, 4), to prove that St. Paul identifies the pre-existent Christ and the Holy Spirit (p. 164) and admits their weakness when he concludes, "From all this we may infer that, while there is no explicit identification in Paul of the Holy Spirit and the pre-existent Messiah, he undoubtedly identified them. As we proceed, we shall see that the question whether Paul did identify the Holy Spirit with the pre-existent Christ was one on which the Fathers of the Church differed" (pp. 164-165). It is clear then that the foundation of Dr. Wolfson's argument for an identification of the Holy Spirit and the pre-existent Christ in primitive Christianity is not primarily St. Paul, but

the early Christian writers prior to the Apologists. As we have seen, his handling of this material is far from convincing.

Worthy of remark is that in the case of Paul Dr. Wolfson proceeds from an inference to knowledge without doubt about an identification of the pre-existent Christ and Holy Spirit in spite of his admission that the Apostle contains "no explicit identification . . . of the Holy Spirit and the pre-existent Messiah." However, in the case of the Fourth Gospel he refused to take seriously into account the very strong statements of a real distinction between the Logos and Holy Spirit because there was, according to him, no "definite statement."

Upon reaching the period of the Apologists, Dr. Wolfson's treatment of the doctrine of the Trinity begins to take a less confused form and, making allowances for his purely philosophical and unbiblical approach, one may find his compilation and arrangement of the patristic material quite helpful.

Dr. Wolfson's insistence that Philo is the Father of the so-called twofold stage theory of the Logos, which he finds in the early Fathers, is open to serious questioning. Philonic influences are of course not to be discarded, for without taking these into consideration much of the early patristic material could be taken out of its historical context. However, Philo must not be given more importance than he actually can have, especially since the Fathers do not make his distinction between an uncreated Logos and a created Logos. Rather the twofold aspect of the Logos' existence and activity is inherent in the Biblical doctrines of creation, divine providence and incarnation. What similarities do exist between Philo and Christian writers in this respect are due to their common concern with the Biblical teaching that created things exist by the will of God. However, between Philo and the Orthodox Fathers there is a radical difference in regard to God's relationship to created reality.

Philo's God, like the God of the medieval scholastics, is not really related to creation by the creative act, since real relationships to creation would compromise His absolute simplicity and make Him contingent on the world. On the contrary, the God of the Bible by an act of will not only created the world but is related to His works really and directly, and in Christ has even united Himself to creation by the hypostasis of the Logos. One may thus say that for the Biblical tradition there are not two stages of relationship with regard to the Logos, but actually three: (1) the Logos has His existence eternally from the Father; (2) He is sent by an act of will of the Father; and (3) He is

sent by the Father to unite Himself with human nature. In each case it is the uncreated Logos Himself Who is sent and not a created imitation, and the relationship established between God and creation is real both ways and not mediated by subordinate creature-gods. St. Dionysius the Areopagite states the case against the Neo-Platonists by claiming that not only does the creature have an ἔρωτα for God but God Himself has a proper and real ἔρωτα for the creature (*Concerning the Divine Names*, IV, 12 ff.). This uncreated ἔρως-energy is not, as A. Nygren believes, the same as in the case of Proclus whose descending ἔρωτες are of lesser intermediary gods. For Dionysius it is God Himself Who descends in His proper and natural ἔρως-energy.

The important question at issue in determining Philonic influence is not the discovery of a distinction between the Logos as related to God and the Logos as related to creation, since these are expressions of Biblical realities, but rather the interpretive problem of whether the Logos Endiathetos is an hypostasis or does He become an hypostasis as Logos Prophorikos. Is the Logos an hypostasis in relation to God, or does He become an hypostasis in relation to God's creative act?

In the patristic texts examined by Dr. Wolfson there is no question of two distinct Logoi, nor is it ever indicated that the Logos, being impersonal, became or was transformed into an hypostasis. All that these passages say is that God, having the Logos eternally in His bosom or heart, sent or projected Him for the purpose of creating, sustaining and saving the world. This is clear, for example, in Theophilus who is dealing with the problem of the divine presence implied in the doctrine of creation and God's relation to the world generally. He is answering the question of how God, Who is contained by no place, can be in a place, such as walking in paradise. His answer is that God, Who is by nature uncontained and therefore prior to the world, has by an act of will become present to the world in the act of creation. "When God willed to create all which He willed, He begot this Logon Prophorikon, the first born of all creation, not Himself being emptied of the Logos, but having begotten the Logos and by His Logos speaking through all." (*Ad Aut.*, II, 22). It is quite clear that for Theophilus the term γεννάω is not used in this passage with respect to the relation of origin of the Logos, but rather to His relation, mission and presence to the created world. Thus Theophilus concludes the discussion concerning the divine presence by stating, "The Logos, therefore, being God and produced from God (ἐκ Θεοῦ περιγένετος), when the Father of all wishes He sends Him to some place, Who being present is both heard and seen, being sent by Him, and is found to be in a

place." (II, 22). The relation of origin of the Logos from God is expressed by the phrase *ἐκ Θεοῦ πεφυκώς*.

It is within such a context that one should interpret the early Christian theologians. Thus, according to Tertullian, God becomes Father and the Logos becomes Son in relation to the acts of creating, saving and sanctifying creation. This does not mean at all, however, that for Tertullian there is a transformation of God and the Logos into Father and Son, nor can this be taken in any modalistic sense. This should be quite clear from Tertullian's struggle against Præxes.

In view of the anti-gnostic concern of the early Fathers, it is unhistorical to interpret the Logos Prophorikos as an hypostatization of the Logos Endiathetos. This would tend to fit into the emanational scheme of the very gnostic systems which these Fathers were fighting. It would be much more realistic and in keeping within the historical context to consider the Logos Endiathetos as a real hypostasis and the sending forth or begetting of the Logos Prophorikos as an indication of the creative energy of the Father through the Son. There is nothing in the texts examined by Dr. Wolfson which proves otherwise.

Dr. Wolfson forgets to mention that for Hippolytus the Logos was first visible only to the Father and then was made visible by the Father to creation that the world may be saved, and thus "there appeared another beside himself." This appearing of "another beside himself" is from the viewpoint of the revelation of the Logos to the world (*δρατὸν ποιεῖ, δπως διὰ τοῦ φανῆναι ἴδων ὁ κόσμος σωθῆναι δυνηθῆ: καὶ οὕτως παρίστατο αὐτῷ ἔτερος*) and not from the viewpoint of the origin of the existence of the Logos from the Father as Dr. Wolfson seems to think (p. 194).

From the very beginning of Old Testament and Christian Revelation there is for the chosen and adopted people of God a unity of spiritual and soteriological experience, but not necessarily uniformity in terminology. This is not only due to the progressive character of revelation and to the evolution of human language, neither is it due exclusively to the inability of human reason to penetrate to what is beyond discursive reason, but rather it is primarily due to the Biblical fact based on the prophetic and apostolic experience that God is by His very nature unknowable and inaccessible even to angels who can see only the uncreated glory of God. Thus God transcends the logical categories, not only of division but of unity also in the mystery of Trinity which is a real mystery because it by nature transcends created reality. God is One and Simple, but He is neither Oneness, nor Unity,

nor Simplicity. The unknowability of the divine essence is radical and absolute. Therefore, variance in terminology is not crucial so long as terms are used as indications and not explanations of the uncreated energies and relations of the superessential Trinity and at the same time as pointers to and not away from union with and division of the glory of the Father through the Son and in the Spirit. Thus it does not matter if *γέννησις* is used to express the sending and not only the relation of origin of the Son. And when *ἐκπόρευσις* is used in the sense of mission it is perfectly Biblical to speak of the Spirit as being sent by the Father through the Son. However, when *γέννησις* and *ἐκπόρευσις* are used as expressions of the relation of origin and of the distinguishing marks of the Son and the Spirit, then the picture changes.

Since the term *γέννησις* was used by certain ancient writers to indicate the mission of the Logos for creating, it was normal for them to speak of this begetting as preceded by the Father's act of will. When *γέννησις* came to refer exclusively to the relation of origin of the Son from the Father, then, as was normal, any antecedent act of will was denied.

Because none of the writers examined by Dr. Wolfson teaches that the Logos was created from nothing and transformed from an impersonal state of existence in God into an hypostasis, and in view of the fact that there is no uniform usage of the term *γεννάω* it does not seem correct to make a distinction between twofold and single stage theories in the early Christian writers. Rather the differences among them are in large measure due to variations in terminology and not so much to difference of opinion. When one takes adequately into account the differences in terminology perhaps he will discover twofold and three-fold stage theories of the Logos in all Orthodox Fathers for the simple reason that they are inherent features of both the Old and New Testament understanding of God's relation to the world.

After discussing twofold and single stage theories of the Logos, Dr. Wolfson picks up once again his Holy Spirit Logos identification and tries to show how the Holy Spirit became for Christians a distinct Person of God.

Dr. Wolfson is quite correct in his observations concerning the scarcity of references to the Holy Spirit as God. Even as late as the fourth century one finds such a Trinitarian champion as St. Basil hesitant in the use of the title God to designate the Holy Spirit. In general, the Greek Fathers refused to speak with precision and clarity concerning the Holy Spirit. In the New Testament the Son reveals the Father

and the Spirit reveals the Son. By the Spirit one is united through the Son to the Father. The Son is the Image of the Father, and the Spirit is the Image of the Son. The Spirit, however, is not revealed by another hypostasis, nor is there any proper Image of the Spirit. Therefore, in a very real sense, the Holy Spirit remains a real mystery accessible only to the metalogical and soteriological experience of those being saved. Although the New Testament seldom refers to the Holy Spirit as God, yet the Spirit is authoritatively the possessor of divine energies, searches the depths of God, is not only sent but "breatheth where it will," teaches and judges the world, etc. According to St. Paul, Christians are temples of God precisely because they are temples of the Holy Spirit. Generally, the Holy Spirit is not an energy of God, but He who possesses the full power and energy of God and energizes by an act of will. According to Biblical presuppositions, the energy, will, power and knowledge of the Holy Spirit cannot be that of a creature and it is obviously for this reason that the Spirit is never referred to as a creature. If the Spirit were a creature, then we are not partakers of the glory of God and are not united to each other and the Father by the Spirit.

After claiming that the New Testament and the Apologists do not call the Holy Spirit by the name God, Dr. Wolfson makes a chronological jump to prove that the belief in the identity of the Holy Spirit and the Logos or pre-existent Christ lingered on into the fourth century. He cites one of the Theological Orations of St. Gregory of Nazianzus (31, 5) in which are discussed various opinions held concerning the Holy Spirit. There were those who held the Holy Spirit "to be God, but concealed this as a pious belief within their heart, without daring to utter it with their lips. Evidently, continues Dr. Wolfson, the reference is to people among whom the belief in the divinity of the Holy Spirit survived as a lingering old tradition from before the time of the Apologists, but because they could not reconcile it with the new harmonization introduced by the Apologists, of which they were followers, they did not dare to confess it openly." (p. 243). Dr. Wolfson fails to take into account the historical and local situation in which these sermons were delivered. Arianism had so completely taken over the city of Constantinople at this time that the Orthodox were left without a Church and constituted a hard-pressed minority. Therefore, there is nothing extraordinary about St. Gregory's hearing of certain orthodox-minded Christians who, because of fear, held their opinions concerning the Holy Spirit to themselves. This local situation in fourth century Constantinople cannot be generalized into a supporting argument for Dr. Wolfson's general vision of the history of the Trinitarian doctrine.

Dr. Wolfson deals with the early patristic doctrine of the Logos and its relation to the Platonic theory of ideas by using the method of uncovering similarities between statements of certain early Christian writers and the Aristotelian, Albinian and Philonic versions of Plato's theory, and states that there are three general categories within which the various patristic opinions may fall: (1) ideas may be in the Logos; (2) they may be outside the Logos; or (3) their existence may be denied altogether.

Very interesting is the fact that Dr. Wolfson discovers in Justin Martyr a rejection of both the Aristotelian and Albinian versions of the Platonic doctrine of ideas (p. 259) and feels that a certain similarity to Philo may be detected in the *De Resurrectione* (7) attributed to Justin. However, it is extremely doubtful whether Justin could accept, as Dr. Wolfson feels, the teaching that God first created subsistent ideas as patterns of things and then the things themselves since this is only one step removed from the Aristotelian version of Plato's theory of ideas which Justin rejects. Besides, there is really nothing in chapter 7 of *De Resurrectione* to justify the feeling that Justin follows Philo.

In examining St. Irenaeus, Dr. Wolfson finds that the bishop of Lyon detects a similarity between the gnostic teachings concerning aeons and Plato's theory of ideas as being outside the mind of God. This version of ideas Irenaeus rejects. Dr. Wolfson points out that this does not mean that Irenaeus rejects the existence of an ideal world contained within the Logos. Thus, there is a close parallel between Irenaeus and Philo, except that for Irenaeus there is no two-stage existence of these ideas and since the Logos, for Irenaeus, is God these ideas are not outside God. (p. 263). What is generally true of Irenaeus' concept of ideas Dr. Wolfson finds also in Tertullian. (pp. 263-266).

Worth mentioning at this point is a passage from Irenaeus, not dealt with by Dr. Wolfson, which indicates the volitional and non-static character of the divine ideas as well as Irenaeus' reluctance to treat of the matter in philosophical categories. Arguing against the gnostic contention that the supreme God generated an eternal and intelligible world of which the material world is a defective copy, Irenaeus writes, "Let them cease, therefore, to affirm that the world was made by any other; for as soon as God formed a conception in His mind, that was also done which He had thus mentally conceived." (*Contr. Haer.*, II, 3, 2). Here Irenaeus is almost identifying the act of creating with the conceptual energy of God and thereby indicates that the will of God has priority and precedence not only over the

creative act but also over the conceptual act. This may be considered an early form of the later patristic insistence on the volitional, dynamic and formless character of the divine archetypes of which the created world is not a poor copy in any Platonic sense but on the contrary created reality itself.*

Dr. Wolfson attempts in several passages to demonstrate that Clement of Alexandria follows Philo's interpretation of Plato's theory of ideas, but in a Christianized form. Open to question, however, is Dr. Wolfson's contention that Clement follows Philo's twofold stage theory of the existence of the Logos as an impersonal concept within God which becomes personal when sent forth by God to create the world. (pp. 208-216, 267-269). In no text examined by Dr. Wolfson does Clement indicate that the Logos before its mission to create was not an hypostasis. This is indirectly admitted by Dr. Wolfson when he points out that Clement maintains the identity of the Logos in both stages of existence, but then feels that although the Logos in the second stage "is a continuation of the same Logos" yet it is "under a different form of existence." (p. 214). The conclusion that it is "under a different form of existence" is not warranted by the texts examined, even if one were to accept the idea that, according to Clement, God first created a world of ideas to serve as a pattern for creation, as Dr. Wolfson tries to demonstrate.

In trying to demonstrate Clement's dependence on Philo's theory of ideas, Dr. Wolfson attempts to overcome the difficulty presented by two passages which clearly state that God is Nous, the dwelling place of ideas. (*Strom. IV, 25, 1: Protrepticus 10*). Dr. Wolfson's arguments for equating the Nous of Clement with Philo's first stage of the existence of Logos, and the Logos of Clement with Philo's second stage of the Logos (pp. 210-211) in order to prove that for Clement, as for Philo, the Logos is the place of the ideal world is not decisive. In *Stromateis IV, 25* Clement clearly states that the Nous is the Father. "Whence the teacher is alone the Logos, the Son of the Nous-Father (νιός τοῦ νοῦ πατρός), Who instructs man." In view of this fact it is obviously much more correct to say that for Clement the Father being

* For a discussion of the problem of the divine archetypes in the doctrine of creation according to the Greek Fathers one should consult Georges Florovsky, TBAPb H TBAPHOCTb in ΙΙΡΑΒΟCΑΑΒΝΑΙΑ MbICAAb, No. 1, Paris 1928, pp. 176-212, partly translated into English and published in *The Eastern Churches Quarterly*, vol. XIII, 1949, Supplementary Issue, pp. 53-77; also Vladimir Lossky, *Essai sur la theologie mystique de l'Eglise d'Orient*, Paris 1944, translated into English under the title *The Mystical Theology of the Eastern Church*, London 1957.

Himself Nous is the source of the divine ideas which are contained at once both in the Father and the Son.

In view of these observations there is also no reason to accept Dr. Wolfson's theory that the divine ideas have for Clement, two stages of existence, an uncreated stage in the uncreated Logos and a created stage in the second stage Logos. Clement's remarks concerning the creation of an intelligible world (*κόσμος νοητός*) is not necessarily a world of ideas in the Platonic or Philonic sense. In the language of the Greek Fathers the created *κόσμος νοητός* or *τὰ νοητὰ* belong to a created realm of motionless time which admits of spiritual development, but excludes "all temporal succession." (V. Lossky, *op. cit.*, p. 102 ff.). This realm of intelligible existence includes the angelic essences and a good indication that Clement means such a world by his created *κόσμος νοητός* is the fact that he calls angels *πρωτόκλιστοι* (first created) as well as *οὐρανοί*. (*Prophetikon Eklogai*, Athens 1956, vol. 8, pp. 348-349). Also in St. Gregory of Nyssa one finds the theory attacked by Plotinus that matter itself is no more than a concourse of simple intelligible qualities, the whole universe being thus one single body. (V. Lossky, *op. cit.*). Perhaps the *κόσμος νοητός* or *μονάς* of Clement, which includes the invisible heaven, the formless or invisible earth and the intelligible light, should also be considered in the light of such a view of created things and it is very possible that Plotinus' attack was directed at the early Christian teachers of Alexandria.

Dr. Wolfson proceeds to a discussion of the theory of ideas in the works of Origen and St. Augustine and concludes that both theologians accepted an Albinian type interpretation of Plato's theory of ideas. His appraisal of Augustine is no doubt correct and generally reflects the accepted interpretation. Perhaps his treatment of Origen needs further elucidation within the context of Origen's Trinitarian doctrine of the unity of rule or monarchy of the Father, keeping in mind the general Alexandrinian approach to the doctrine of God.

Dr. Wolfson ends his treatment of the patristic theories of ideas by stating the representative character of the writers dealt with. (pp. 285-286). However, in view of Dr. Wolfson's indication of the chronological limits of the patristic material to be dealt with generally in his book, St. Augustine in the West and St. John of Damascus in the East (p. ix), one cannot but feel the absence of material from the Greek Fathers of the Church, especially from the Cappadocian Fathers, St. Dionysius the Areopagite, and St. Maximus the Confessor who were so important in expressing the traditional Biblical point of view. Not taking this material into account, it was natural for Dr. Wolfson to

overlook the basic difference which exists between the Greek Fathers and the Western theologians who follow Augustine. (See G. Florovsky, *op. cit.*, and V. Lossky, *op. cit.*). The difference is of such a nature that upon becoming acquainted with the Augustinian type theory of divine ideas in the 14th century, the Greeks officially condemned the prevailing Western teaching as heretical.

Besides the aspects of the problem dealt with by Dr. Wolfson, there is also involved in determining the patristic doctrine of divine ideas the whole question concerning the radical inaccessibility and incomprehensibility and unknowability of the divine nature, the Greek Patristic distinction within God between the divine essence or nature, the divine hypostases, and the uncreated divine energies or volitional archetypes or Godhead, and the relationship of these divine volitional energies or archetypes to the monarchy of the Father and through the Son and in the Spirit to creation. These volitional energies or archetypes of God are either identical with the divine essence, as in Augustine, and therefore determinations of the divine nature, or they are within God after and around the divine essence, formless and volitional in character and unhypostatic enhypostatic natural powers of the divine nature. Also involved is the problem of whether these volitional-energy-wills, which we may call the glory of God, are present in created things really as their sustaining principle, united unconfusedly with creation, or only related indirectly through created effects, the divine essence being the unrelated archetypal cause of creation. Then there is the question of whether the created substances are complete and pure natures from the time they come into existence or whether they are subject to an history of perfection by becoming conformed by a dynamic process to the indwelling and uncreated energy-will or grace of God. This then raises the further question of whether reason can arrive at a correct knowledge of God by presupposing a real analogy of being between the created order and the uncreated living God of the Bible or whether correct opinions concerning God can come only by revelations from God Himself. Then can one suppose that within the realm of revelation the Biblical names of God can be construed as definitions of the nature of God? In other words is there such a thing as a real *analogia fidei* which would allow theologians to speculate about the divine nature by taking the Biblical names of God to be revelations of a conceptual nature subject to either the discursive or contemplative reason of man? The answer to this question would depend on the further question of whether the archetypal-energy-wills are substantial forms or unsubstantial and formless and whether they are the terminus of the vision of God or is there a suprarational penetration beyond the divine ideas, and if so does it reach the divine nature, or is the divine

essence by its very nature unknowable, impenetrable and radically in-accessible to all creatures including angels?

Herein lies a radical difference, concerning the unknowability of the divine essence, between the Greek Fathers and philosophers in general, including Philo, which underlies the patristic approach to the mystery of the Holy Trinity. In Platonism and Neo-Platonism, and even in Philo, God is inaccessible not because the divine essence is by nature unknowable, but rather in so far as human reason is involved in the multiplicity of material phenomenon by its separation from the divine realities or the divine simplicity. Dr. Wolfson points out that Philo is the first thinker to introduce the idea "that God, in His essence, is unknowable." (*Philo*, vol. 2, p. 110 ff.). Yet Philo does allow, according to Dr. Wolfson, that man may attain to a progressively greater knowledge of the divine essence "even though never to a complete knowledge of it." (*Ibid.*, p. 149). This is also the opinion of the Western Christian theologians generally. In contrast to this, the Greek Fathers reject the possibility of even a partial knowledge of the divine essence. (See e.g. St. Basil, Ep. 235.)

Dr. Wolfson's failure to take into account the implications of the Biblical and patristic doctrine of Creation, especially in its cosmological and gnoseological aspects, seems to explain his oversight of the apophatic character of the doctrine of God and this conditions his whole approach to the mystery of the Trinity. Like all philosophers and logicians outside the soteriological experience in Christ, he is forced to deal with patristic theology by taking seriously for granted the co-ordination of human concepts concerning numerical unity and simplicity with the divine reality, thereby reducing God to the level of conceptual images. Thus he believes that the patristic use of the philosophical categories was necessitated by the philosophical desire to unite two extra gods accumulated by historical accidents and misunderstandings to the originally One God of Israel. (p. 305 ff.). After the elevation of the Logos and the Holy Spirit to the level of Gods, "the Fathers found themselves confronted with a new problem, the problem of how to reconcile their new Christian belief in three Gods with their inherited Jewish belief in one God." (p. 308). For Dr. Wolfson the problem is very simple and clear. It is simply a matter of knowing how to count from one to three. "As philosophers, the problem must have presented itself to them in a double aspect. First, they must have asked themselves, how can immaterial beings like God and the Logos and the Holy Spirit be counted as three. Second, granted that they can be counted as three, they asked themselves, how can they be one." (*Ibid.*).

In his description of early patristic Christianity as a process of disintergration and degeneration from Judaic monotheism into pagan polytheism and of attempted return to belief in one God, Dr. Wolfson misses the very foundations of how the Christians themselves viewed the doctrine of the Trinity. The Fathers of the Church never felt that they were commissioned with the task of philosophically constructing a unity out of three Gods. In claiming that God is neither Oneness, nor Unity, nor Simplicity (Gregory of Nyssa, St. Dionysius the Areopagite) one sees the Fathers laughing at those people who think they can set up an arithmetical idol and call it God. Rather the concern of the Fathers was of a purely soteriological nature. They were interested not in uniting Gods to each other but in being themselves united to God. It is one thing to say that God is One and quite another thing to define God as Oneness, Unity, and Simplicity.

Having the Biblical and patristic principle of the radical unknowability of the divine essence in mind as the key to approaching the patristic usage of philosophical categories in the history of Trinitarian doctrine one finds Dr. Wolfson's treatment of the subject out of touch with historical reality. However, in spite of this his analysis of the patristic application of Aristotelian categories to the doctrine of the Trinity is very well done and quite useful.

Dr. Wolfson finds the unity of God expressed by the Apologists in terms of the monarchy or unity of rule and sees this also in Origen, Tertullian, Basil, John of Damascus, and Augustine. However, his observation that the Fathers "started on their search for an analogy for the relative unity in the Trinity apart from the unity of rule . . ." (p. 315) is open to question, especially since their doctrine of the radical incomprehensibility of the divine nature clearly prevented them from the temptation of introducing philosophical explanations of the divine essence and explains their refusal to apply even the categories of simplicity in any conceptual sense. Except for the case of Augustine the Fathers in question, as well as all the Fathers of the East, never attempted to go beyond the Biblical doctrine of monarchy and unity of rule which alone points to but never defines or explains the identity of essence. That the Father Himself was considered as the substratum of the Son and Holy Spirit (p. 353) was not only normal but the only possibility. The essence common to the Trinity was never considered, as Dr. Wolfson clearly points out, a common superstratal genus or pre-existing substratal material. Neither did they think, however, of the essence apart from the hypostases in terms of spacial separation whereby one person could derive its existence from the common essence of the Father and Son as in the case of Augustine. For the Greek Fathers

the modes of existence of the Son and the Spirit by generation and procession belong to the essential aspect of God's existence and are therefore completely and radically beyond human understanding. "What then is Procession? You tell me what is the Unbegottenness of the Father, and I will explain to you the physiology of the Generation of the Son and the Procession of the Spirit, and we shall both of us be frenzy-stricken for prying into the mystery of God." (St. Gregory the Theologian, *Fifth Theolog. Orat.* VIII). St. Augustine's attitude to the mystery of the divine essence was quite different. ". . . I will not be slow to search out the substance of God, whether through His Scripture or through the creature." (*De Trinitate* II, pref.). His *Filioque* is a product of his desire to conceptualize the generation and procession of the Son and Spirit and of his reduction of the divine essence to the categories of unity and simplicity and of his subsequent inability to distinguish between God in His essence and God in His Glory or Energies and Activities which are alone accessible by revelation to man. Dr. Wolfson accepts the general Western opinion that some of the Greek Fathers accepted the double procession of the Holy Spirit from the Father and the Son. Not accepting any distinction between the essence and glory or activity of God, it was normal for Augustine to believe that the sending of the Spirit by the Son means procession from the Son and Western theologians generally interpret the Greek Fathers using Augustine as their guide. The whole question involves the Greek patristic distinction between the essence and energies of God of which Augustine was not aware and which Western theologians generally refuse to take into consideration. It also involves the further question concerning the patristic insistence on the radical incommunicability of the "hypostatic attributes" which Western theologians never take seriously.

HOLY CROSS
GREEK ORTHODOX THEOLOGICAL SCHOOL



Copyright and Use:

As an ATLAS user, you may print, download, or send articles for individual use according to fair use as defined by U.S. and international copyright law and as otherwise authorized under your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement.

No content may be copied or emailed to multiple sites or publicly posted without the copyright holder(s)' express written permission. Any use, decompiling, reproduction, or distribution of this journal in excess of fair use provisions may be a violation of copyright law.

This journal is made available to you through the ATLAS collection with permission from the copyright holder(s). The copyright holder for an entire issue of a journal typically is the journal owner, who also may own the copyright in each article. However, for certain articles, the author of the article may maintain the copyright in the article. Please contact the copyright holder(s) to request permission to use an article or specific work for any use not covered by the fair use provisions of the copyright laws or covered by your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement. For information regarding the copyright holder(s), please refer to the copyright information in the journal, if available, or contact ATLA to request contact information for the copyright holder(s).

About ATLAS:

The ATLA Serials (ATLAS®) collection contains electronic versions of previously published religion and theology journals reproduced with permission. The ATLAS collection is owned and managed by the American Theological Library Association (ATLA) and received initial funding from Lilly Endowment Inc.

The design and final form of this electronic document is the property of the American Theological Library Association.

The conscientious and thorough use of all the sources available, their re-examination under new and brighter light, the new interpretation as presented by Professor Geanakoplos, his sound and convincing argumentation, his masterful conception, composition, and working out of the entire theme, and above all his objective but lively outlook, will certainly recommend this book highly to the undiluted esteem of the historians and prove it to be a worthy and illuminating contribution to Medieval history.

COSTAS M. PROUSSIS

MARKOS SIOTIS, *'H Θεία Εὐχαριστία (The Holy Eucharist: The Information of the New Testament concerning the Holy Eucharist, in the light of the Ecclesiastical Interpretation)*. Thessalonica: M. Stougiannaki Press, 1957. Pp. 71.

The liturgical "renaissance" which has prevailed so extensively in the West during this century, and which has been inspired primarily by fresh and objective studies on the liturgical life and theology of the Eastern Church, has also a compelling character for the contemporary Greek Orthodox theologian whose task lies in his obligation of studying and exposing both to the Orthodox and non-Orthodox the treasures of the liturgical life of his Church. Professor Siotis, of the Faculties of the Theological School of the University of Thessalonica and of the University of Athens, has done precisely this, namely, the presentation, in a comprehensive way, of the liturgical theology of the Eastern Church. To be sure, the author is eager to inform his readers, from the very beginning, that his intention is not to present any critical analysis of the works on Orthodox Liturgical Theology which till now have been published. He wants rather to present a systematic synopsis of the teaching of the Orthodox Church concerning the Eucharist, that is to say, the already expressed ecclesiastical interpretation of this Sacrament. In other words, Professor Siotis bases his research on purely Patristic grounds and on the genuine roots of the ecclesiastical tradition. This approach has far reaching effects indeed, because the author proceeds to the study of the Sacrament on the Orthodox ecclesiological presupposition, through which the understanding of our Liturgical Theology is magnified. Consequently, Ecclesiology and Liturgical Theology form an inseparable structure of the Orthodox Theology, an "existential" united reality in which one lives his Orthodox faith and at the same time participates in the joys of liturgical experience.

Thus Professor Siotis' first task is to demonstrate the close relationship and cross-reference of the essence of the Sacrament with the

"hypostasis," the essence of the Church. He rightly points to the fact, therefore, that the fundamental meaning of the Church lies precisely in the unity of the faithful through their communion in Christ. But through the Sacrament of the Eucharist this unity and communion becomes more substantial, more spiritual, more complete. This is why the Eucharist is the center of the Church and the more positive expression of the unity of the Church. The criterion, consequently, of the ecclesiological reality is neither the objective number of the participants nor their synaxis in the church, but more concretely the ontological communion of the faithful with Christ attained through the Sacrament of the Eucharist. Moreover, through this communion in Christ, the ontological relationship and affiliation with the faithful is reached. Thus the mystical body of Christ, the Church, is constituted and "the blood of Christ circulates in all the members of His mystical body, viz., His Church." So far so good. Professor Siotis does not stop here. He rightly observes that for the Greek Fathers, the Sacrament of the Eucharist has also a profound soteriological meaning. Eucharist for them is the lowest step of God's condescension which is needed for the completion of man's salvation. In other words, for them, the Sacrament of the Eucharist is an extension and a prolongation and the substantial projection of the mystery of redemption towards mankind. From this presupposition naturally springs the precise relation of the Sacrament with the Incarnation of the Divine Logos. For the Greek Fathers the establishment of the Sacrament, and more explicitly, the presence of the Lord in it, formed the main purpose of Christ's incarnation. This is why, for them, the Sacrament of the Eucharist is considered the recapitulation of the divine Economy in Christ, from the moment of His incarnation till the Final Judgment. More specifically, however, the Sacrament of the Eucharist is the Sacrament through which the Incarnate Logos of God, being received by the faithful, acts and fulfills the redemption through each of the faithful, and their resurrection in the eternal life. Thus the anthropological perspective of the Eucharist comes into the picture, and united with the theological interpretation forms the stratum and the basis upon which the salvation of the man is fulfilled. In other words, for the Greek Fathers, in the Sacrament of the Eucharist, the integral communion of both the divine and human natures of Christ takes place, the faithful receive the whole person of Christ, the incarnate, crucified, resurrected and ascended Lord. We become, thus, one body (*syssomos*) and one blood (*synaimos*) with Christ according to St. Cyril of Jerusalem's expression, while death and corruption are banished (St. Irinaios). The image of God in us is restored and our nature is elevated and exalted into a divine "hypostasis."

This is the general view of the Orthodox ecclesiastical thought concerning the Sacrament of the Eucharist which is presented and expounded by Professor Siotis creatively and constructively. But this task does not remain passive. He is eager to discuss the problematic aspects of certain points as, for instance, the celebrated "eschatological" interpretation of Eucharist. According to the Orthodox interpretation of the Sacrament, the Eucharist should be understood and lived as the praxis of the sanctification of the world by the Church, and not as a certain condition of the Kingdom of God. In other words, through the Eucharist, neither the Kingdom of God is transferred to the faithful, nor the faithful are transposed to that Kingdom; but rather through the transfusion of the incorruptible nature of the Theanthropos the incorruptibility of the human nature is attained, through which we enter into the Kingdom of God.

With pleasure the reviewer also acknowledges the fact that the author with ease and precision discusses the participation of all the Holy Trinity in the Sacrament (which he rightly accepts) and the change of the elements of bread and wine into the very Body and the very Blood of Christ. He refers to the patristic terminology "metavoli" (metapoiesis, etc.) but is careful to note (rightly, we think) that the Orthodox view at this point is a stance of reverence which does not lead to scholastic interpretations, but confronts the question with the faith of the redeemed. Therefore, he stresses the fact that the way of the change is unintelligible in reality, a fact which should be always remembered by both Orthodox and non-Orthodox theologians.

Professor Siotis' contribution to the Liturgical Theology of the Church is indeed significant. A New Testament scholar himself, he combines not only genuine knowledge of the New Testament sources, but in addition a vast knowledge of the Patristic material, which he uses pertinently and successfully. His references to the Fathers and to other ecclesiastical writers are many and well documented. But Prof. Siotis does not write a "dry" account of patristic references. Nor does he present a superficial discussion. He seems to live the liturgical life of the Church. A brilliant scholar but at the same time a pious Orthodox, Professor Siotis has proven to us, not only through his excellent writing but at the same time with his own liturgical praxis, that indeed Church and Eucharist are organically and ontologically united in the plane of existential reality, which is so richly lived in the liturgical scope of the Orthodox Church.



Copyright and Use:

As an ATLAS user, you may print, download, or send articles for individual use according to fair use as defined by U.S. and international copyright law and as otherwise authorized under your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement.

No content may be copied or emailed to multiple sites or publicly posted without the copyright holder(s)' express written permission. Any use, decompiling, reproduction, or distribution of this journal in excess of fair use provisions may be a violation of copyright law.

This journal is made available to you through the ATLAS collection with permission from the copyright holder(s). The copyright holder for an entire issue of a journal typically is the journal owner, who also may own the copyright in each article. However, for certain articles, the author of the article may maintain the copyright in the article. Please contact the copyright holder(s) to request permission to use an article or specific work for any use not covered by the fair use provisions of the copyright laws or covered by your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement. For information regarding the copyright holder(s), please refer to the copyright information in the journal, if available, or contact ATLA to request contact information for the copyright holder(s).

About ATLAS:

The ATLA Serials (ATLAS®) collection contains electronic versions of previously published religion and theology journals reproduced with permission. The ATLAS collection is owned and managed by the American Theological Library Association (ATLA) and received initial funding from Lilly Endowment Inc.

The design and final form of this electronic document is the property of the American Theological Library Association.

HIGHLIGHTS IN THE DEBATE OVER THEODORE OF MOPSUESTIA'S CHRISTOLOGY AND SOME SUGGESTIONS FOR A FRESH APPROACH¹

By THE REV. JOHN S. ROMANIDES

In 1932 and 1933 A. Mingana published two newly discovered Syriac versions of Theodore of Mopsuestia's lost Catechetical Orations on the Creed, the Lord's Prayer, and the Mysteries and thereby touched off a lively debate which reached a sort of climax in recent years with scholars still sharply divided. In his comprehensive study entitled "The Christology of Theodore of Mopsuestia," A. Sullivan concludes that ". . . it cannot be denied that Theodore of Mopsuestia, despite his orthodox intentions, was indeed what he has so long been called: the 'Father of Nestorianism.'"² In sharp contrast to this no less a Cyrilian scholar than Paul Galtier can claim that "La 'conjonction' dont parle Théodore est manifestement la même que celle que Cyrille appellera 'Hypostatique.'"³

In 1946 E. Amann published the first comprehensive study of Theodore's theology based on all the now available sources.⁴ Although the author recognized some Nestorianizing tendencies in Theodore, he is on the whole satisfied with the Christology of both the condemned fragments and the Catechetical Orations as translated and printed by Mingana. He sees no contradiction between the old and the newly discovered sources. He believes that Theodore's Christology is in fundamental agreement with the Chalcedonian doctrine of two natures. After quoting a fragment preserved by Facundus of Hermiane he comments, "c'est presque l'expression de φύσις ἐνυπόστατος qui'imaginera Léonce de Byzance."⁵

¹ For recent bibliography and listing of sources see B. Altaner, *Patrology* (London 1960), pp. 372-373.

² *Analecta Gregoriana*, vol. LXXXII (Romae 1956), p. 288.

³ Théodore de Mopsueste, Sa vraie pensée sur l'incarnation, *Recherches de science religieuse*, 45 (1957), p. 339.

⁴ Théodore de Mopsueste, in *Dictionnaire de Théologie Catholique*, vol. XV, a, 235-279. Here one can find the bibliographical material available before the Mingana editions.

⁵ *Ibid.*, col. 257.

In 1948 R. Devreesse's "Essai sur Théodore de Mopsueste"⁶ appeared, containing an exhaustive study of the historical vicissitudes of Theodore's theological reputation together with a careful analysis of the political and theological factors which led finally to his condemnation by the Fifth Ecumenical Council in 553. Approximately half of the book is devoted to the history of the process leading to the condemnation, and the remainder to a review of the sources (4-52), to a study of Theodore's exegetical method (53-93), to an exposition of Theodore's doctrinal system (94-124), of which only nine pages (109-118) are devoted to the Incarnation and Christology, and to a fifteen page review of the extracts from Theodore's writings condemned by Pope Vigilius and the Fifth Ecumenical Council. These fifteen pages compose Chapter IX of a book of ten chapters, and as they are a detailed attempt to prove the complete unreliability of the Conciliar fragments, so many of which are supposed to have been deliberately falsified by the enemies of Theodore, they come as a climax to more than support the contention of the preceding 117 page historical narrative and documentation of a messy business. Without raising the question of the justice or injustice of Theodore's condemnation one wonders whether Chapter IX should have been included in or just after the discussion of sources. Chapters IV-VIII obviously presuppose Chapter IX. Any reader reacting normally to the historical presentation would by the time he reaches Chapter IX more than welcome evidence of deliberate falsification to round out his indignation.

The work of Devreesse is not only indispensable for the study of Theodore, but also presents an important contribution to the imaginative theory concerning a one-sided emphasis in Eastern Christology on Cyrilian categories, leading finally to the abandonment of strict chalcedonianism for what is by some called the neo-chalcedonianism of the Fifth Ecumenical Council.⁷ The crux of this thesis is the contention that under the pressure of the monophysite schism the Orthodox of the East were forced into a position of diplomatic compromise and, in what amounts to an outright rejection of the chalcedonian balance between Alexandrian and Antiochene Christology, made the theopassianism of Cyril's twelfth anathema the tessera of Orthodoxy. It is this one-sided overthrow of the chalcedonian balance, initiated by the Scythian Monks, which, according to Devreesse, opened up the way to the condemnation of Theodore.

⁶ *Studi e Testi*, 141, Città del Vaticano, *Biblioteca Apostolico Vaticana*, 1948.

⁷ E.g. Charles Moeller, "Le chalcédonisme et le néo-chalcédonisme" in *Das Konzil von Chalkedon, Geschichte und Gegenwart* (Würzburg 1951), pp. 637-720.

I. Ortiz de Urbina⁸ seems to be the only one of the early reviewers who challenged Devreesse's thesis concerning the falsification and general unreliability of the condemned fragments. Three years after the appearance of Devreesse's "Essai" A. Sullivan⁹ published an article strongly contesting Devreesse's manipulation of the texts and rejecting his conclusion of unreliability. Thereupon, in 1953, J. L. McKenzie¹⁰ composed an article taking exception to Sullivan. In his introductory remarks he mentions that it is the first time that Sullivan's name appears in scholarly publications and judging from his article one should expect to see it often in the future. Then he proceeds to prove that Theodore's exegesis of John I, 46-51 was in a few instances deliberately and maliciously quoted out of context, thereby making it appear that the Mopsuestian held opinions which he actually attributed to Nathaniel.

While this lively discussion over the textual problem was going on, *The Irish Theological Quarterly* printed a very instructive article by Kevin McNamara entitled "Theodore of Mopsuestia and the Nestorian Heresy."¹¹ McNamara rejects all attempts to discredit the condemned fragments as sources in the study of Theodore's Christology. The first part of his article, in which he takes a definite stand on the reliability of the fragments, appeared before the publication of McKenzie's short study just mentioned and undoubtedly explains his complete confidence in the available sources. McNamara recognizes fully the obvious one-sidedness of the collections made to discredit Theodore, but sees no reason why they cannot be used. "What is beyond all doubt, however — and, let us stress it again, it is the essential point — [writes McNamara] is that for Theodore the problem of Christ's unity was the problem of the unity of two subsisting natures, and with this premise it was inevitable that he should set up what was in fact nothing more than an accidental union. His attempt to analyse the manner of the union showed up this fact quite clearly. His failure was a warning to the later Antiochenes against further attempts to speculate on the relation between the union of natures in Christ and other kinds of union. Yet — though we are not here concerned directly

⁸ *Orientalia Christiana Periodica*, XV (1949) 441. J. M. Vosté had challenged an earlier attempt of Devreesse to prove falsification of certain texts. For a discussion of this controversy see F. A. Sullivan, *op. cit.*, p. 99ff.

⁹ Some Reactions to Devreesse's New Study of Theodore of Mopsuestia, *Theological Studies*, XII (1951) 179-209.

¹⁰ "The Commentary of Theodore of Mopsuestia on John I, 46-51," *Theological Studies*, XIV (1953), 73-84.

¹¹ XIX (1952) 254-274; XX (1953) 172-191.

with their teaching — it seems clear that Nestorius and Theodoret of Cyrus also failed to approach the problem from the standpoint of the appropriation by the Word of the human nature, and so that human nature was inevitably for them, too, a human person. Aristotelian philosophy with which the Antiochenes, more than other Christian thinkers of their time, were familiar, could not suggest that it was anything else; for Aristotle the individual substance was, quite understandably, always complete in itself and independent.”¹²

Three years later, in 1956, Sullivan's name appeared in a decisive manner as the author of the major work already mentioned in which he accepts two groups of passages as the only examples of deliberate distortion of the original intent by quoting out of context.

In his insistence on the general unreliability of the hostile fragments Devreesse had found strong support in the works of Marcel Richard,¹³ who also had concluded categorically that the theology of Theodore can no longer be culled from the condemned dogmatic fragments published in Migne or Swete.¹⁴ Sullivan devotes 123 pages of his thesis checking and testing the contentions of Richard and Devreesse. While admitting that the fragments present a one-sided view of Theodore's Christology, since those passages were collected which demonstrate the heretical points of his theology, Sullivan claims: “We have now considered all the evidence offered by Richard and Devreesse to prove the thesis that the fragments of Theodore's works preserved in the hostile florilegia are so generally corrupted that they should be ignored in a study of his Christology. We believe we have shown that this thesis is substantiated only to the extent that in a relatively small number of cases, the conciliar extract is so cut from its context as to give a misleading citation. On the other hand, in not a single case does the alleged forgery, interpolation, or textual alteration remain as the only possible, or indeed, as the more probable explanation of textual variants between the hostile fragments, and independent versions of Theodore's work. It should be noticed that there is not a single case where the text of a hostile fragment differs from a reliable Greek citation of the same passage. The case for textual

¹² *Op. cit.*, XX, 189-190.

¹³ “La tradition des fragments du traité περὶ τῆς ἐνανθρωπίσεως de Théodore de Mopsueste,” *Le Muséon*, LVI (1943) 55-75. “Les traités de Cyrille d'Alexandrie contre Diodore et Théodore, et les fragments dogmatiques de Diodore de Tarse,” *Mélanges dediés à la mémoire de Félix Grati*, I, Paris 1946, p. 113f.

¹⁴ Migne, P.G., 66, 969-993; H. B. Swete, *Theodore of Mopsuestia on the Minor Epistles of St. Paul* (Cambridge 1882), vol. II, pp. 289-339.

alteration rests entirely on the witness of translations: in particular, Syriac translations. It presumes that these translations are so literally faithful to the original Greek that variations from them would prove a hostile citation to have been maliciously altered.”¹⁵

In his exposition of Theodore’s Christology Sullivan attempts to prove that the Antiochene theology concerning the person of Christ developed out of the Arian controversy. The Arians attributed all the human frailties of Christ to the nature of the Logos and thereby tried to prove His created and inferior status. St. Athanasius attacked the Arians by maintaining on the one hand the traditional attribution of all human properties and activities to the Logos, but on the other hand he made a clear distinction between the Word in His uncreated nature and the Same Word united to humanity by means of His Birth from the Virgin. The Logos is born, lives the life of man, suffers, and is resurrected not in His divine nature but in His humanity.

The Antiochene theologians reacted to the Arian argument quite differently. Whereas Eustathius of Antioch attributes human acts to the Logos before the Arian controversy, and even applies the title “Deigenetricem”¹⁶ to the Virgin, he later changed his mode of speaking and introduced two subjects of attribution. Divine properties and acts belong strictly to God the Word, whereas all things of human nature belong to Him in Whom the Word dwells.

Apollinaris vigorously opposed this position and insisted on the attribution of all things pertaining to the human and divine in Christ to the Logos. The Logos was born from the Virgin without any change or transformation of the divine nature and it was the Logos Who suffered in the flesh. In this respect this was the same position adopted by St. Athanasius, except that Apollinaris went to the extreme of safeguarding the identity of the Logos as the only subject in Christ by insisting that the Logos took the place of the Platonic ἥγεμονικὸν or κυνηγικὸν in Christ. Since a complete man is a νοῦς ἐν σαρκὶ and since Christ is just such a νοῦς, but the divine νοῦς ἐν σαρκὶ, Christ is both perfect God and perfect man, One, not two. Therefore, in Christ there is one energy and one composite nature.

Following the general line of Eustathius, Diodore of Tarsus vigorously attacked the Apollinarin position. Sullivan takes note of Grillmeier’s contention that in spite of his anti-Apollinarism Diodore still

¹⁵ *Op. cit.*, pp. 156-157.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 165.

adheres to the "Logos-flesh" Christology. Diodore did not center his attack on Apollinaris on the question of the human mind in Christ. Diodore was above all concerned with the Apollinarin mixture of Logos and flesh into one nature, and by insisting on the distinction of natures ended up with a distinction of subjects. Sullivan goes to much trouble finding passages in Diodore to demonstrate that he taught the completeness of Christ's human nature and concludes that the "Logos-flesh" scheme applied to Diodore by Grillmeier may be misleading.

After a short discussion of M. Jugie's work on Diodore,¹⁷ wherein the chief error of the bishop of Tarsus is described as his failure to distinguish between nature and person, Sullivan returns to his main argument and demonstrates how Diodore reacted against the Apollinarists. While attacking their mixture of the human and divine in Christ into one nature, Diodore failed to recognize "the true principle which Apollinaris had been trying, though unsuccessfully, to explain and defend. In other words, there was an element of truth in the system of Apollinaris: a recognition of the fact that the Word had truly been born, according to the flesh, of the Virgin Mary, and that Jesus of Nazareth was not another person distinct from the eternal Son of God."¹⁸ Diodore failed to see this and therefore distinguished between Him Who is the Son of God by nature and him who is both by nature the son of David and by grace the son of God.

The description of this theological milieu, within which Theodore was theologically nourished, is a very valuable and well done piece of work which supplies the foundations of Sullivan's exposition of Theodore's Christology. Basically Theodore remained faithful to the theological method of his predecessors. However, he made an important advance over them by realizing that the lack of unity had been a grave weakness of their Christology and tried to correct it. "The distinction of the two natures in Christ, and their union in one prosopon, is the characteristic of Theodore's Christology at every period of his career. . . . In view of Theodore's consistent stress on the union of the two natures in one person, one may ask how it can be that there is still question of his orthodoxy on this question of the unity of Christ."¹⁹ Sullivan devotes 105 carefully written pages to a detailed examination of texts in order to determine "(1) Theodore's concept

¹⁷ "La doctrine christologique de Diodore de Tarse d'après les fragments de ses œuvres," *Euantes Docete*, II (1949) 171-191.

¹⁸ *Op. cit.*, pp. 187-188.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 201.

of the 'two natures'; (2) his concept of their union; *scil.* the incarnation; (3) his concept of the 'one person' in whom the two natures are united."²⁰ Since we will mention some of the important points of Sullivan's handling of the material later in this paper we may at present quote his final remarks which will help understand some of the reactions. Sullivan concludes: "The cardinal point of contradiction between Cyril and Nestorius turned precisely on the question whether or not God the Word is the Subject of whom the Creed said: 'He was born of the Virgin Mary.' According to Nestorius, this can be said of 'Christ,' of 'the Son,' of 'the Lord,' — but not of God the Word. In this he showed himself a faithful exponent of the principles of Theodore of Mopsuestia. The decision of the Fathers of Ephesus meant that it was not sufficient to unite the two natures in one prosopon. One did not do justice to the basic fact of Christianity unless one understood that this 'one person,' this subject of whom the Creed said both that He was begotten of the Father, and that He was born of the Virgin Mary — is in fact none other than God the Word. If the failure to recognize this fact is the root-error of Nestorius, then it cannot be denied that Theodore of Mopsuestia, despite his orthodox intentions, was indeed what he has so long been called: the 'Father of Nestorianism.' "²¹

It is interesting to note that Sullivan maintains a balance in his use of the hostile fragments by studying "them in the light of all other evidence."²² In other words the question of the reliability of the hostile fragments does not present one with the key to Sullivan's method of arriving at a synthesis of Theodore's Christology. In this respect Sullivan shows a tendency to subordinate these fragments somewhat by not allowing them an independent authority.

Keeping this in mind one finds it instructive to turn to the article of Paul Galtier entitled "Théodore de Mopsueste: Sa vraie pensée sur l'Incarnation," published the year after Sullivan's thesis appeared.²³ While he evidently accepts Sullivan's defense of the reliability of the condemned fragments,²⁴ and even adds some arguments to the cause,²⁵ he takes strong exception to Sullivan's interpretation of Theodore. As a standard for judging Theodore, Sullivan had followed the sugges-

²⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 202.

²¹ *Ibid.*, p. 288.

²² *Ibid.*, p. 158.

²³ *Recherches de science religieuse*, 45 (1957) 161-186, 338-360.

²⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 162.

²⁵ E.g. *Ibid.*, p. 167, n. 21.

tion of Grillmeier and used the Nicene Creed as expounded at the Council of Ephesus which accepted the second letter of Cyril to Nestorius as containing the substance of the Church's faith.²⁶ Galtier flatly rejects this as illogical and unjust. ". . . est-il juste et logique de juger du langage de Théodore d'après celui de saint Cyrille?"²⁷ Cyril can be used as a standard only in the light of St. Leo, and St. Leo can be used only in the light of St. Cyril. Sullivan's way of presenting the issue is actually no different from that of the Monophysites who rejected Leo's Tome to Flavian. Here Galtier is touching upon the very nerve center of the whole discussion concerning the Christology and condemnation of the bishop of Mopsuestia. The basic theological presuppositions of such scholars as Devreesse, Richard and C. Moeller, who either explicitly or implicitly support the theories concerning chalcedonianism and neo-chalcedonianism mentioned above, are quite clear. If the Council of Chalcedon is viewed as a restoration of the Christological balance upset temporarily by the one-sided Cyrilian Council of Ephesus in 431,²⁸ and if the Fifth Ecumenical Council is regarded as a return to the Alexandrian exclusiveness of the Third Council, then the theology of Theodore should be viewed in the light of Chalcedon. The very basis for the condemnation of Theodore at the Fifth Council was the fact that under pressure from the "imperial couple" to adopt a diplomatic theology the Eastern bishops accepted Cyril's exclusiveness to the practical exclusion of Leo's Tome. Theodore cannot be judged, therefore, from this one-sided point of view. In order to maintain this thesis some Roman scholars are prepared to claim that Pope Vigilius did not accept the dogmatic definitions contained in the anathemas of the Fifth Council. This leaves Chalcedon as the only possible standard of orthodox Christology and the only acceptable standard for judging Theodore.

Having this viewpoint in mind it is quite obvious that Sullivan has left himself wide open by using Cyril and Ephesus as his point of departure. McKenzie also charged Sullivan with setting for Theodore an impossible canon of orthodoxy in an article which appeared in

²⁶ *Op. cit.*, p. 30f.

²⁷ *Op. cit.*, p. 164.

²⁸ It is interesting to note that the Chalcedonian definition states that it accepts the epistles of Cyril to Nestorius and the Orientals "and to which (epistles) it reasonably adapted the letter of Leo . . ." (ἐπιστολὰς . . . αἵς καὶ τὴν ἐπιστολὴν τοῦ . . . Λέοντος . . . εἰκότως συνήρμοσε . . .). The minutes of the Council nowhere reflect any doubt about Cyril's Orthodoxy whereas Leo's Tome was objected to and finally accepted in the light of Cyril. That the Fathers subordinated the Pope's theology to that of Cyril is also strongly reflected in this quotation from the Conciliar Decree.

1958.²⁸ Judging from the method adopted in his book as well as by his answer to McKenzie it is quite obvious that Sullivan has not fully grasped the fact that he unwittingly side-tracked himself by taking Grillmeier's suggestion seriously, and instead of arguing to the point he has been arguing past it. From an authoritarian viewpoint, which one would ordinarily expect about the early Ecumenical Synods from Roman Catholics, Sullivan's presentation could be considered a self-sufficient study which has definitely proved its point. However, the whole issue is very much complicated by the fact that the scholars in question do not take Ephesus seriously. It is worth noting that they may be quite verbose about Cyril's one-sidedness but they never openly question the Council of Ephesus, which was completely dominated by this same Cyril. They simply insist on Chalcedon and overcome the Council of 553 in the manner mentioned.

With this background in mind one can very much appreciate Galtier's penetrating analysis of Theodore's Christology. Being a specialist in the linguistic variations of patristic theology, he brings his keen insight to bear and attempts to demonstrate that Theodore's theology is quite sound when his language is approached within the geographical setting of his own time. There is no need to take seriously the question of the reliability or unreliability of the hostile fragments, because actually when seen within the time and place in which they were written, and understood within the general context of Theodore's theology, these fragments are quite sound. Although Theodore was using a different language, he was professing in substance the same doctrine as Cyril. The reason why the fragments in question were condemned by Cyril and the Fifth Council is that they were not fully understood. Galtier attempts to prove that for Theodore, as for Cyril, the prosopon effected by the union of the two natures in Christ is the very prosopon of the Holy Trinity. He rejects as absurd the idea that for Theodore the prosopon effected by the union is a *tertium quid*. As one of the keys to his argument Galtier takes one of the supposedly most unreliable Greek texts and points out very convincingly that in speaking about each perfect nature as having its own prosopon when considered apart and one prosopon in common when considered in union, Theodore is not saying that there are two prosopa. Therefore, he does not see why the Syriac translation should be considered more faithful and what exactly the Apollinarists gained by doctoring up such a passage as this, as Richard claims.²⁹ There are two persons corre-

²⁸ "Annotations on the Christology of Theodore of Mopsuestia," in *Theological Studies*, 19 (1958) 3, 345-373.

²⁹ Galtier, *op. cit.*, p. 167, n. 21.

sponding to the two perfect natures only when one considers each nature abstractly. In reality, however, there can never have been two prosopa since the union was never preceded by any division. Ἐσχε μὲν εὐθὺς ἐξ ἀρχῆς ἐν τῇ κατὰ τὴν μήτραν διαπλάσει τὴν πρὸς αὐτὸν ἔνωσιν.³⁰ Theodore's speaking of the prosopon effected by the union then is no different from Cyril's way of speaking abstractly about two ὑποστάσεις or φύσεις being united, so that "after the union, the separation having been abolished, we believe that the nature of the Son is one, as belonging to one, who, however, has become man and flesh."³¹ According to Galtier, the real difficulty underlying this Theodorean and Cyrilian manner of speaking abstractly about two natures or prosopa before the union and concretely of one prosopon or nature after the union, was the fact that φύσις, ὑπόστασις and πρόσωπον were still synonymous and inseparable in the field of Christology at this time. The distinctions already made between φύσις, or οὐσία on the one hand and ὑπόστασις or πρόσωπον on the other for the doctrine of the Trinity had not yet been introduced into Christology, and the Chalcedonian contribution of an ἀπόσωπος or ἀνυπόστατος human φύσις was yet in the future.

A key passage offered by Galtier to prove his general position is one in which the Logos as subject unites the man to Himself and thereby the Logos Himself becomes the unique prosopon of the union.³² Perhaps the strongest point of Galtier's presentation, at least for one with a critical eye for loopholes, is his insistence that "Theodore never dreamed of defining the nature or the mode of this union. On the contrary, here again is a point on which he is in advance of one mind with St. Cyril. In effect both proclaim absolutely its ineffable character. . . . Questioned about the sense of the expression καθ' ὑπόστασιν, he [Cyril] called it 'physical,' in opposition to a moral union; but to those who asked what he means by 'physical union,' one knows that he always restricted himself to the answer: 'real union.' "³³ However,

³⁰ Migne, *P.G.* 66, 976D; Galtier, *op. cit.*, p. 181. However, in the following passage Theodore seems to presuppose a little more than two abstract prosopa: "Si chacun d'eux était par nature fils et seigneur, on pourrait dire deux fils et deux seigneurs, selon le nombre des personnes (prosopon); mais puisque l'un est par nature fils et seigneur, tandis que l'autre n'est naturellement ni fils ni seigneur, — mais que c'est par sa conjonction exacte avec le (Fils) Unique, Dieu le Verbe, que nous croyons qu'il réçut ces (Titres), — nous confessons qu'unique est le Fils." R. Tonneau, "Les Homélie Catéchetiques de Théodore de Mopsueste, *Studi e Testi* 145, Città del Vaticano, *Bib. Apost. Val.*, 1949, p. 209.

³¹ Ep. XL, Migne, *P.G.* LXXVII, 192D-193; Galtier, *op. cit.*, p. 180, n. 53.

³² *Ibid.*, pp. 175-176.

³³ *Ibid.*, pp. 183-184.

it is questionable whether Galtier's thesis can stand a stiff test at this very point. Would it have been really possible for Theodore to agree with Cyril's φυσικὴ or καθ' ὑπόστασιν ἔνωσις without giving up his basic presuppositions? Nestorius' reaction to this term was violent and there are good indications that Theodore would have at least had strong hesitations. Although Sullivan did not discuss this aspect, he did devote the first part of his synthesis to the failure of Theodore to distinguish between what could be predicated to the nature of the Word and to the Word as such, and thereby made a very important contribution to a correct approach. This failure of Theodore is very interesting because Sullivan's forefathers in theology were accused of heresy during the *Filioque* controversy for exactly this same failure.

Before he could acquire a copy of Galtier's article McKenzie had already committed the review of Sullivan's book mentioned above to the press and just managed to include a footnote in which he seems surprised at how Galtier arrived at his conclusions "with few references to falsifications by the compilers of the extracts of Theodore's works."³⁴ In this article McKenzie strongly challenges Sullivan's treatment of the reliability of the Syriac versions and his synthesis of Theodore's Christology. McKenzie reviews Sullivan's treatment of two texts and two groups of texts and makes the following strong point: "No doubt Sullivan is right in warning that it would be rash to apply to these three capitula the adage, *A uno discit omnes*, and hence to reject the conciliar extracts en bloc (Sullivan, p. 111). But it is also rash, I think, to affirm that, because a man has been proved a liar in three instances, he is therefore reliable in other instances where no proof has been adduced, particularly when the motive of the lie which has been proved is also operative in the other instances. There is no similar proof which casts doubt on the veracity of the Syriac translators. Sullivan's suspicions may be correct; but even after Sullivan's examination no convincing reason is presented why we should trust the mendacious compilers of the florilegia where they differ from the Syriac translators. To trust the translators is not to affirm the 'absolute literal accuracy' of their work, nor to deny that they were subject to the human weaknesses of translators. But we do not know that they were deliberately perverting the evidence; we do know that the compilers were. . . . It has been proved, and Sullivan has accepted the proof, that the compilations exhibit in some instances the compiler's way of putting a thought rather than that of the author; and it has certainly been shown that the compilers did not feel themselves bound to reproduce every phrase, every

³⁴ *Op. cit.*, p. 373, n. 80.

last word of their prototype. Until the dishonesty and bad faith of the Syriac translators have been equally well demonstrated, it is difficult to see how we can treat the two sources as of equal value. I do not say, indeed, that Sullivan treats them as of equal value; but his insistence that they must be used if one is to form a complete synthesis of Theodore's Christology must be taken with qualification."³⁵

McKenzie is actually defending the conclusions which he had reached in the eleven-page article printed in 1953 already mentioned. As we have seen, Sullivan accepts McKenzie's contention that the compiler's quoting of Theodore out of context in interpreting John 1:46-51 has deliberately presented him in an unfavorable light. McKenzie does not see, however, why Sullivan does not agree with his conclusions.

Three quarters of a year later Sullivan answered McKenzie in a well written article entitled "Further Notes on Theodore of Mopsuestia."³⁶ In his defense of his treatment of the hostile fragments he does not hesitate to call upon Galtier³⁷ for help in regard to the one fragment mentioned. In his discussion concerning "The Value of the Syriac Versions" Sullivan agrees with McKenzie on the question of how much literal accuracy one may expect from the Syriac translations and points out the fact that Richard and Devreesse presupposed extraordinary literal accuracy. When Sullivan is suggesting that in some cases the more likely explanation of a discrepancy is to be sought in the departure of the translator from the original, he does not see why we should be bound to demonstrate the dishonesty and bad faith of the translator as McKenzie demands.³⁸ "In the first place the departure may have been indeliberate. In the second place, they can be judged only by the standards that were expected of translators of their own day."³⁹

In the second part of his answer Sullivan defends himself against McKenzie's charge of setting an impossible canon of orthodoxy for Theodore's lifetime. One cannot help but sense that this part is intended also as an answer to Galtier's similar accusation. For the reasons already mentioned Sullivan seems to have missed the point. In the last section of his answer Sullivan seems to successfully defend his thesis against McKenzie's counter-interpretations of certain texts.

³⁵ *Op. cit.*, pp. 353-354.

³⁶ *Theological Studies* 20 (1959) 2, pp. 264-279.

³⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 267.

³⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 272.

³⁹ *Ibid.*

There are several other scholars who have dealt with Theodore's theology since the Mingana publications of 1932-33. Some of the defenders of the traditional view of Theodore's Nestorianism are M. Jugie,⁴⁰ W. De Vries,⁴¹ J. M. Vosté,⁴² M. Anastos,⁴³ and H. M. Diepen.⁴⁴ A. Grillmeier⁴⁵ and T. Camelot⁴⁶ recognize the basic elements in Theodore which finally lead to Nestorianism. R. V. Sellers⁴⁷ and J. N. D. Kelly⁴⁸ maintain the basic soundness of Theodore's Christology within the background of the healthy elements of Antiochene Christology generally and at the same time recognize its typical Antiochene weaknesses. Kelly utilizes few of Sullivan's points and rejects his basic conclusion "Theodore was no Nestorian, and the doctrine of 'two Sons' repelled him."⁴⁹ Although Kelly does not seem to have Galtier's work on Theodore in mind, his conclusions are very similar. He writes that Theodore's "true teaching, it would seem, is that the Incarnate is 'one prosopon,' and by this he means that He is the 'one subject' Who can be addressed now as God and now as man. This comes out in the fact that, while he was constantly alert to distinguish in his exegesis between the two natures, he was also aware that Scripture spoke of the two natures together. The Bible, as he points out, predicates what belongs both to the divinity and to the humanity 'as of one alone' (*Hom. cat.* 6, 6, 8, 10, 8, 11f.), it applies different titles to Christ 'as to a single prosopon' (*ib.* 3, 10). So prosopon in his vocabulary connoted 'Person' in the fullest sense of the word. The God-man, he declares, is one prosopon, and he nowhere speaks of there being two prosopa before, or in abstraction from (a disagreement with Galtier), the union of the natures. Such a doctrine has been attributed

⁴⁰ Le Liber ad baptizandos de Théodore de Mopsues e, *Echoes d'Orient*, XXXIV (1935) 257-271

⁴¹ 'Der Nestorianismus' Theodors von Mopsuestia in seiner Sakramentenlehre," *Orientalia Christiana Periodica*, VII (1941) 91-148

⁴² Théodore de Mopsuestia sur les Psalmes," *Angelicum*, XIX (1942) 179-198

⁴³ The Immutability of Christ and Justinian's Condemnation of Theodore of Mopsuestia," *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, VI (1951), 125-160

⁴⁴ *Les Trois Chapitres au Concile de Chalcédon. Une étude de la christologie de l'Anatolie ancienne* (Oosterhout, 1953)

⁴⁵ Die theologische und sprachliche Vorbereitung der christologischen Formel von Chalcedon," in *Das Konzil von Chalkedon, Geschichte und Gegenwart*, ed. Grillmeier-Bacht, vol. I, (Wurzburg 1951), pp. 5-202

⁴⁶ De Nestorius à Eutyches L'opposition de deux christologies," in *Das Konzil von Chalkedon, op. cit.*, pp. 213-242

⁴⁷ *The Council of Chalcedon* (London 1953) Also *Two Ancient Christologies* (London 1940)

⁴⁸ *Early Christian Doctrines* (London 1958)

⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 308

to him, but on the basis of texts which have been tampered with by his later detractors."⁵⁰ Kelly does not specify which texts he is referring to. Actually there is only one Greek text in which such an interpretation and reliability problem was clearly seen^{50a} and it was already mentioned together with Galtier's penetrating analysis of it. For this text there is a Syriac parallel which twice mentions one prosopon and one hypostasis when contemplating the union. Of this text Kelly says, "We are bound to regard the Syriac version with considerable suspicion."⁵¹ One wonders if Kelly means to throw suspicion on both Greek and Syriac versions of this text.

Of course it is beyond the scope of this paper to take up the question of the hostile fragments in detail. However, there are certain texts which have been singled out for special discussion in the above mentioned debate between Sullivan and McKenzie. We will make some remarks about three of these texts hoping thereby to make some helpful suggestions to a more balanced approach.

The first textual problem we will deal with is McKenzie's alleged proof that the compiler of the hostile fragments deliberately quoted Theodore's interpretation of John 1:46-51 out of context in order to make it appear that Nathaniel's use of the terms 'King' and 'Son of God' expressed the mind of Theodore. When these passages are read within context it is obvious that Theodore considered Nathaniel's understanding at this time inadequate and carnal. McKenzie thinks, and Sullivan agrees, that this exegesis is perfectly sound, and would be shared by most modern Scripture scholars.

It is quite obvious that both Sullivan and McKenzie failed to realize that the compiler was not a modern Scripture scholar but a man of his own times. It is very possible that the compiler did not agree with Theodore's interpretation of Nathaniel's mind. It is more than probable that the compiler believed that Nathaniel fully understood what he was saying in confessing, "Rabbi, thou art the Son of God, thou art the king of Israel." In his commentary on this passage St. Cyril takes great care to prove how and why Nathaniel came to realize that Christ is the Only-Begotten Son of God. According to Cyril, Nathaniel knew fully well what he was confessing.⁵² Origen goes to the trouble to

⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 306-307.

^{50a} For another possible text connoting two persons see note 30.

⁵¹ *Op. cit.*, p. 306.

⁵² Migne, *P.G.* 73, 221C-224A.

point out that this passage is not referring to "one of many sons, but to the Only-Begotten, being the king of the chosen race."⁵³ This interpretation of Nathaniel's mind is diametrically opposed to that of Theodore. There can be no reason to doubt that the Apollinarists were using such an interpretation of Nathaniel's confession to prove that Christ is the natural Son of God. This is clearly reflected in Theodore's insistence in the condemned Capitula 34 that "Certainly (Nathaniel) was saying that he was son of God not according to the birth of divinity, but because he was familiar with God . . ." For those engaged in such a controversy over the interpretation of this confession the insertion of the whole context within which Theodore refers to the obscure and carnal nature of Nathaniel's mind would not serve to clear the bishop of Mopsuestia but only demonstrate further his perverseness. It would be more than normal for the opponents of Theodore to think: "Every pious Christian knows that Nathaniel fully understood that Christ is the natural Son of God begotten of the Father before the ages. Only a heretic could deny this." It is extremely naive to think that the compiler felt that he had to quote deliberately out of context, especially when there are numerous other passages in which Theodore denies that He Who was born of the Virgin is the natural and Only-Begotten Son of God and consubstantial with the Father. The fact that Theodore considers Nathaniel's understanding obscure and carnal at this point does not mean that he elsewhere professes to believe that the natural Son of God became the natural Son of Mary, thus making it necessary for the compiler to deliberately distort and misrepresent the real mind of Theodore. It must also be remembered that the passages under question express clearly Theodore's understanding of the prevailing Jewish ideas about the coming Messiah which most modern students of the Bible would at least tolerate. However, there is every indication to believe that such tolerance was not characteristic of the times under question. Proof of this is the fact that the compiler presented Theodore's understanding of Nathaniel's mind for condemnation.

One may add at this point that the same observations are applicable to the similar case of quoting out of context in regard to Theodore's commentary on the Centurion's faith expressed in Matthew 8:5-13.⁵⁴ Vigilius is clearly aware that the fragments express the mind of the Centurion and not that of the author. Yet the Pope condemns this inadequate interpretation of the Centurion's faith. Sullivan thinks that Vigilius would have revised his criticism had he seen the whole con-

⁵³ Commentary on John, frag. XXVI.

⁵⁴ See Sullivan, *op. cit.*, pp. 104-106.

text. This is certainly an unrealistic attitude since Vigilius is clearly finding fault with Theodore's interpretation of the Centurion's faith and already knows Theodore's faith from so many other passages in which Christ is Son of God not by nature, but by grace. Here again it is clear that the compiler was not interested in the context, but in Theodore's interpretation of the Centurion's faith.

One of the important problems regarding the hostile fragments centers in a text preserved in Greek by Leontius of Byzantium which we already mentioned when discussing Galtier's study of Theodore. As we have seen Galtier fails to see how this passage is supposed to help the Apollinarist cause as Richard seems to think. Theodore here speaks of two prosopa in abstraction only. Concretely there can be only one prosopon effected by the union before which there was no division. "For when we distinguish the natures," writes Theodore, "we call the nature of God perfect, and [we call] the person perfect also, because it is impossible to speak of an impersonal hypostasis. We call likewise the nature of man perfect, and the person [we call perfect] as well. But when we look toward the conjunction, we then say one person . . . thus when we attempt to distinguish the natures, we call the person of the man perfect, and that of the divinity also perfect. When we contemplate the union, then we proclaim the person to be one, the natures two."⁵⁵

There is a Syriac version of this text (cod. 14669) published by Sachau⁵⁶ and translated literally back into Greek by Richard,⁵⁷ in which the clause "because it is impossible to speak of an impersonal hypostasis," is omitted. On the other hand wherever the Leontius fragment speaks of "one person" the Syriac fragment adds the phrase "one hypostasis." Richard favors the Syriac text because he suspects the extra clause in the Leontius fragment. He points out that the only way this clause makes any sense is when "hypostasis" is taken as being synonymous with "nature." Richard reasons that since "hypostasis" and "nature" had already been distinguished in the doctrine of the Trinity, this phrase could not mean very much to Theodore's readers. Galtier and Sullivan also accept these terms as being synonymous, but argue that the Trinitarian distinction had not yet been introduced into Christology. To these observations one may add a possible explanation of the seemingly sharp differences between the Syriac and Greek texts

⁵⁵ Swete, vol. II, pp. 299-300; Sullivan, *op. cit.*, p. 64ff.

⁵⁶ Text in Swete, vol. II, pp. 299-300.

⁵⁷ "La tradition des fragments du traité περὶ τῆς ἐνανθρωπήσεως de Théodore de Mopsueste," *Le Muséon* LVI, 1943, p. 66.

which does not make it necessary to suspect the honesty of either the compiler or the Syriac translator.

It would have been quite normal for a mild chalcedonian, wishing to see in Theodore an orthodox father, as was actually the case with some, to understand the clause in question as evidence that Theodore taught that in Christ there is one hypostasis after the union. In other words, Theodore's remark "it is impossible to speak of an impersonal hypostasis" would also mean "it is impossible to speak of an unhypostatic person." Once this is done the whole passage in question would be translated not literally but according to what the translator takes as its real meaning and in post-chalcedonian language. Thus the clause in question disappears from its proper place and reappears in the same passage elsewhere. We now find "one hypostasis" added to "one person." But in the Syriac text under consideration this is not all. Every time the word "person" exists by itself it is replaced by "hypostasis" in the Syriac. Thus in the Leontius fragment the word "person" is mentioned six times and "hypostasis" appears only once. In the Syriac text "person" appears twice and "hypostasis" is mentioned four times. The application of Eastern Trinitarian terminology to Theodore's Christology by a chalcedonian friend is obvious.

This substitution of the word hypostasis for person in the works of Theodore became a serious problem for the Nestorians for whom hypostasis and nature were still synonymous.⁵⁸ In the eighth century the Nestorian Joseph Hazzaya complained of such a systematic interpolation in Theodore's *De Incarnatione* and *De Fide*. The interpolator had substituted "one hypostasis" wherever Theodore spoke of "two hypostases." In his study on Joseph Hazzaya, published in 1910, Addai Scher mentioned that he was in possession of a complete Syriac translation of *De Incarnatione* in which Theodore speaks of "one hypostasis" in Christ everywhere he was dealing with the question of union. Nevertheless, there is no evidence that the defenders of Theodore presented any such texts at the time of the Fifth Ecumenical Council. It is possible perhaps that monophysites may have interpolated some of Theodore's texts to show that the chalcedonian formula of "one hypostasis" and "two natures" is Nestorian.

The third and last group of texts to be examined are related to Theodore's interpretation of Rom. 9:5 where St. Paul speaks of the Jews "from whom is Christ according to the flesh, Who being God

⁵⁸ See Sullivan, *op. cit.*, pp. 59-64, for pertinent discussion.

over all is blessed unto the ages, amen." In two passages, one preserved by Cyril and the other condemned by Pope Vigilius and the Fifth Council,⁵⁹ Theodore takes great care to point out that St. Paul "ita dicit . . . non quod ex Judaeis et secundum carnem est, qui super omnia Deus est"⁶⁰ or "Nemo igitur neque eum, qui secundum carnem ex Judaeis est, dicat deum, nec iterum deum, qui est super omnia, secundum carnem ex Judaeis."⁶¹ Both these fragments have parallels in the Syriac version of Theodore's Catechetical Orations, but here they appear slightly altered, e.g., with the word "naturaliter" added. Thus Theodore says not only that he who is from the Jews according to the flesh is not God, but that he is not "by nature" God. "For there is no one who would recognize that 'He who is born from among the Jews according to the flesh' is by nature God, nor that 'God over all' is by nature from the Jews."⁶² There is a third passage in the Syriac text where Rom. 9:5 is interpreted and again the word "naturaliter" appears.⁶³ Both Richard and Devreesse accept the Syriac version as authentic and the Latin fragments as the product of corrupt intentions. Sullivan, of course, defends the authenticity of the Latin fragments, but in such a way that McKenzie is not satisfied. Sullivan spends eight pages⁶⁴ weaving a series of facts and probabilities into an overall probability in favor of the Latin texts.

Perhaps the most important point of Cyril's attack on Nestorius is his insistence that He Who was born of the Virgin according to the flesh is by nature God and consubstantial with the Father. St. Athanasius had said this clearly before him. But Nestorius repeatedly denies this and persistently claims that He Who was born of the Virgin is not by nature God and therefore the title Theotokos is dangerous and if used should be done so with strict qualifications. It is only when John of Antioch repudiated Nestorius on this point that peace was restored. In his letter to Cyril, John clearly confessed that the Same Who was born of Mary is consubstantial with the Father according to divinity and consubstantial with us according to the humanity.⁶⁵ This for Cyril meant the acceptance of the full significance of the title Theo-

⁵⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 90-91.

⁶⁰ St. Cyril, *Migne, P.G.* 76, 1447.

⁶¹ *Act. Conc. and Vig.* 31, Swete, p. 327.

⁶² Tonneau, *op. cit.*, pp. 137-139. Cf. p. 61.

⁶³ *Ibid.*, p. 201.

⁶⁴ *Op. cit.*, pp. 90-98.

⁶⁵ See text in T. H. Bindley, *The Oecumenical Documents of the Faith* (London 1950), p. 142.

tokos. In his answer to John, Cyril writes, "For it is your absolute duty clearly to understand that well-nigh the whole of our contest for the faith has been waged round our affirmation that the holy Virgin is Theotokos."⁶⁶ In the light of this fact it is not necessary to make Cyril out to be an ecclesiastical politician to understand why he could accept the Antiochene way of speaking about two unconfused and undivided natures. That the Son of Mary, or that the Son of David is "naturaliter" the Son of God is the most fundamental Christological insight of Cyril and underlies his whole theology concerning the Theotokos. One must not forget also that this is the very foundation of the Apollinarin attack on Diodore and on this question St. Gregory the Theologian clearly sided with Apollinaris. In this respect at least Apollinaris was certainly victorious over his opponents even at the Council of Chalcedon which clearly insisted that He Who was born of the Theotokos is "consubstantial with the Father according to the divinity."⁶⁷ It is quite clear, therefore, that there can be no conceivable reason why the Apollinarists or Cyril or any adherent to the Council of Ephesus or the union of 433 would drop the term "naturaliter" from Theodore's texts. Judging from the hostile attitude of the compiler one may rest assured that he would have kept the "naturaliter" since it would have better demonstrated an identity of teaching with Nestorius. Rather than postulate corruption on the part of the Latin texts there seems to be little doubt that the Syriac translator introduced the "naturaliter" in order to make the passages more clearly Nestorian and anti-Cyrilian and at the same time to avoid the impression that Theodore is denying the divinity of Christ altogether. He is certainly not God by nature, but He is God by grace, according to Theodore.

The methodological problem in dealing with Theodore's Christology has confronted us in certain ways, especially in regard to the criterion to be used in determining whether or not he can really be considered the "Father of Nestorianism." At the suggestion of Grillmeier, Sullivan had restricted himself to Cyril and Ephesus as the standard for judgment, leaving the Council of Chalcedon and the Tome of Leo out of his theological discussion. He simply examines the possible reasons why the Council did not discuss the question of Theodore.⁶⁸ However, the basic problem is not the question why Theodore personally was not discussed, but whether the Council accepted a profession of faith in essentials similar to that of Theodore. If, as many

⁶⁶ *Ibid.*

⁶⁷ Text in Bindley, *op. cit.*, p. 193, lines 113-114.

⁶⁸ *Op. cit.*, p. 8ff.

believe, the Council accepted as sufficiently orthodox what Theodore had already taught, then he is certainly not the "Father of Nestorianism," unless, of course, one believes that Chalcedon was a vindication of Nestorius.

We have mentioned the fact that in a very important way the profession or definition of faith at Chalcedon represents an Apollinarin victory over Diodore and Theodore. It has already been pointed out that the center of controversy between Apollinaris and Diodore was not over the question of the human soul of Christ, nor over the mixture of natures, but rather over the question of the consubstantiality with the Father of Him Who was born of the Virgin. Apollinaris not only insists on this repeatedly, but also speaks of the Logos becoming consubstantial with man because of His union with the Body. Thus Christ "is consubstantial with God according to the invisible spirit, the flesh also being included in the name, because it is united to him who is consubstantial with God, and again He is consubstantial with men, the divinity being included in the body, because it was united to that which is consubstantial with us. The nature of the body, continues Apollinaris, is not changed in the union with Him Who is consubstantial with God and in the participation of the consubstantial name, neither does the nature of Godhead change in the communion of the human body and in the name of the flesh which is consubstantial with us."⁶⁹ Elsewhere he writes that Christ "therefore did not *become* son, but is by nature."⁷⁰ In a letter to a certain Peter he writes, "We say that the Lord is by nature God and by nature man."⁷¹ To Jovianum he claims, "He Who was born from the Virgin Mary is by nature God and true God, and not by grace or participation."⁷²

As we have already indicated, this basic vision of Apollinaris that Christ is both by nature God and by nature man is clearly expressed in the profession of faith of John of Antioch which brought about the union of 433 and is repeated in the Chalcedonian definition. "Following, then, the holy Fathers, we all unanimously teach that our Lord Jesus Christ is to us One and the same Son, the Self-same of a rational soul and body; *consubstantial with the Father according to the Godhead, the Self-same consubstantial with us according to the Manhood* . . . before the ages begotten of the Father according to the Godhead, but in the last days, the Self-same, for us and for our salvation [born]

⁶⁹ Hans Lietzmann, *Apollinaris von Laodicea* (Tübingen 1904), p. 188, 9f.

⁷⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 243, 7.

⁷¹ *Ibid.*, p. 247, 14.

⁷² *Ibid.*, p. 251, 12-14.

of Mary the Virgin Theotokos according to the Manhood . . .”⁷³ In commenting on the Chalcedonian profession of the double consubstantiality of Christ neither Bindley⁷⁴ nor I. Ortiz de Urbina⁷⁵ suspect that Apollinaris had said the same. Bindley writes that “the latter half, ‘co-essential with us as to manhood,’ had occurred in Nestorius’ Sermon 3, and had no doubt come into partial use before this as a counter-statement to the doctrine of Apollinaris that Christ’s Body was consubstantial with the Godhead.”⁷⁶ It is noteworthy that Apollinaris not only insisted on the double consubstantiality of Christ, but also proclaims repeatedly that anyone who says that the flesh of Christ is consubstantial with God is anathema.⁷⁷

Nestorius never accepted this teaching concerning the double consubstantiality of Him Who was born of the Theotokos. Whether Diodore and Theodore would have finally accepted it along with Theodoret and Ibas when confronted by an Ecumenical Council we will never know. That they threw everything they could muster at Apollinaris exactly on this issue is beyond any question whatever. This is more than clear from Theodore’s *Contra Apollinarem*. After what seems to have been a long argument Theodore asks, “Therefore how do you . . . claim to acknowledge him who was born of the Virgin to be God from God, consubstantial with the Father, unless by chance you command us to impute his creation to the Holy Spirit? . . . Nevertheless, neither according to your own definition is it at all possible to proclaim him who was born of the Virgin to be God from God, consubstantial with the Father. For if, as you say, he who was born from the Virgin was not an assumed man, but God made flesh, how can he who was born be called God from God and consubstantial with the Father, since the flesh is not able to sustain this name? For it is madness to say that God is born of the Virgin. . . . He Who is consubstantial with the Father was not born from a womb . . .”⁷⁸ This same attack on the double consubstantiality of Christ is clearly repeated in the Catechetical Homilies.⁷⁹

⁷³ T. H. Bindley, *op. cit.*, p. 193 (trans. pp. 234-235).

⁷⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 146.

⁷⁵ “Das Symbol von Chalkedon. Sein Text, sein Werden, seine dogmatische Bedeutung,” in *Das Konzil von Chalcedon*, p. 398ff.

⁷⁶ Bindley, *op. cit.*, p. 146.

⁷⁷ H. Lietzmann, *op. cit.*, p. 254, 3f.; 255, 11f.; 262-263.

⁷⁸ Swete, *op. cit.*, pp. 312-314. This denial of the double consubstantiality of the unique hypostasis in Christ is clearly seen in Theodore’s denial that the titles Only-Begotten and First-Born can be applied to the One and the Same. Tonneau, *op. cit.*, pp. 61-63, 99-101. For the most obvious denial that the One and the Same is both by nature God and by nature man in the Catechetical Homilies see Tonneau, pp. 209-211.

If Nestorianism can be defined as a denial of the fact that the One Lord Jesus Christ Who was born of the Virgin is consubstantial with the Father according to his divinity and consubstantial with us according to his humanity, then there can be no doubt that Theodore is on this point in essential agreement with Nestorius and in direct opposition to the Council of Chalcedon. It seems that in his arguments with Apollinaris Theodore simply forgot his doctrine of one prosopon in Christ. Why didn't Theodore speak of the one prosopon effected by the union of two natures in Christ as consubstantial with the Father? The answer is quite simple. The one person in Christ effected by the union of natures is not the second hypostasis of the Holy Trinity. The divine nature or hypostases cannot themselves be united by nature to any creature. As we shall see, Theodore fully agrees with Nestorius at this point.

Using the inductive method of searching through Theodore's works to see if he can find any indication of predication of the human things of Christ to the Logos in distinction from the divine nature, Sullivan comes to the conclusion that the terms Logos and divine nature are actually interchangeable. Sullivan senses that this lack of distinction explains partially Theodore's inability to predicate all the acts of Christ, both divine and human, to the Logos as to one unique subject.⁷⁹

One can go further and point out that Theodore's doctrine of the Trinity on essential points is quite different from that of the Alexandrian and Cappadocian Fathers and it is quite obvious that his presuppositions and arguments against the Arians and Eunomians must have differed considerably from theirs.

In Cappadocian and Alexandrian theology the real distinction between the Logos and the Father is based on the belief in a real incarnation of the second hypostasis of the Trinity. One of the most important reasons why the term *homoousios* was in the beginning suspect was that it could be interpreted in a Sabellian sense as was actually done by Paul of Samosata. It is only when it was made perfectly clear that this term does not imply that the Son is identical with the essence or hypostasis of the Father or with an unhypostatic energy of God that it was accepted by such Fathers as St. Basil. "Those who say that essence and hypostasis are identical," writes St. Basil, "are driven to the necessity of confessing different persons only, and by attempting to get around saying three hypostases, they find themselves unable to

⁷⁹ *Op. cit.*, pp. 205-215.

escape the evil of Sabellius." For the Cappadocians there is a real distinction between essence and hypostasis not only for the exclusion of Sabellianism, but also as a protection against the attacks of Eunomius. This may seem at first paradoxical, but it is true.

Eunomius was arguing that the word "Father" or "Unbegottenness" was a definition of the very hypostasis or essence of God. From this premise he concluded that the hypostasis which is, therefore, "Son" and "begotten" must be heterosubstantial and so a creature. The Cappadocians argued that the words "Father" and "Unbegottenness" are not definitions of the divine essence, but denote the mode of being or existence of a real hypostasis and its relation to the other hypostases of the Trinity. There can be no name or definition of the nature of God. The essence of God is by its very nature unknown to all creatures and beyond the conceptual powers of man. Even the word God cannot be applied to the nature of God because the essence of God is nameless. Every name is in some sense a definition. However, when applied to God names denote either the acts of God or the mode of existence of the divine Persons, but never the essence.

When one turns to Theodore he cannot help but wonder what kind of arguments he could have used against the Arians and Eunomians. Together with Eustathius of Antioch⁸⁰ he claims that the word God is a name of the divine nature,⁸¹ thus giving the impression that the Three Persons of the Trinity shared in either an Aristotelian "substratal preexisting material" or a Platonic type "superstratal genus."⁸² God is one not so much because the Father is one unique cause and source, as Apollinaris together with the Cappadocians taught. For Theodore, God is one because the divine essence is one. For Eustathius the word God belongs not to the Divine Persons but to the divine essence. Otherwise, there would be three Gods.⁸³

Theodore seems to go much further than Eustathius. He claims that the word Father is also the name of the divine nature.⁸⁴ One is immediately reminded of the fact that the Eunomians would agree with this wholeheartedly since it proves that the Son is another essence

⁸⁰ See frag. 83 and 84 in M. Spanneut, *Recherches sur les écrits d'Eustathie d'Antioche* (Lille 1948), p. 127.

⁸¹ Tonneau, *Hom. IX*, 6, pp. 223-225.

⁸² For a good discussion of these concepts see H. A. Wolfson, *The Philosophy of The Church Fathers* (Cambridge, Mass.) 1956, p. 342f.

⁸³ *Op. cit.* Compare this with St. Gregory of Nyssa's Letter to Ablabius.

⁸⁴ Tonneau, *op. cit.*, pp. 211-213, 221, 223.

unlike that of the Father. What kind of answer could Theodore have given the Eunomians on this point? Simply that the Son also is the divine essence and the Holy Spirit likewise.⁸⁵ Thus it seems that we have here a doctrine of the Trinity not very different in one respect at least from that which prevailed in the West. Each Person is identical with the divine essence, although not identical with the other persons, and God is one not because the Father is the only cause and source of divinity, but because the underlying essence is one and each Person is this essence.

When one is confronted with this kind of language one has the right to wonder if he is not dealing with a theology which is maintaining the accepted forms of an official state religion but whose basic presuppositions are quite different. This is certainly to be expected in any situation where the state and hierarchy are constantly struggling to impose a uniformity of faith. There can be no doubt about Theodore's zeal against the Arians and Eunomians. It must be remembered, however, that Sabellius and Paul of Samosata would have shown just as much enthusiasm for the overthrow of this new polytheism. We are not trying to suggest that Theodore was a Sabellian; his fervor against any form of theopassianism would count this out. Nor are we suggesting that he was a crypto-Samosatene. Theodore calls Paul of Samosata an "angel of satan" because "he says that Christ our savior is a simple man and fails to recognize that hypostasis of the divinity of the One before the ages."⁸⁶ However, the fact that theologians are struggling against each other does not mean that their basic presuppositions are necessarily different. There is a thread of presuppositions running right through Paul of Somosata, the Arians and Nestorians, which bears this point out and also seems to be the key to understanding Theodore's Christology.

Although he seems quite confident that Theodore has no metaphysical explanation to offer for the union of two natures, because the Mopsuestian supposedly considers this to be in the realm of mystery, still Galtier expresses in a footnote⁸⁷ a slight reservation by referring to a possible clue in the fragments of Theodore's letter to Domnus.⁸⁸ Perhaps by tracing out the meaning of this passage in the light of other passages with the help of the general Syrian theological environment we can arrive at a very important clue for the better understanding of both Nestorianism and Arianism.

⁸⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 57, 211-213, 221-223, 237-239, 267, 281, 365, 369, 393.

⁸⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 381.

⁸⁷ *Op. cit.*, p. 183, n. 58.

⁸⁸ Swete, vol. II, pp. 338-339.

In this letter Theodore writes "and why is it necessary to say any more? The reason of the union according to essence is true [or applicable] only in the case of consubstantials, but in the case of things not consubstantial it is not applicable [or true], there being no clear [reason] possible for confusion. But the manner of union according to good-will, while preserving the natures, demonstrates the one person of both inseparably, and also the one will and one energy, together with the one authority and rule which is consequent to these."⁸⁹ It is quite clear that Theodore is here limiting the concept of essential or natural union to consubstantials. Thus the Persons of the Trinity can be united by nature to each other, but not to things heterosubstantial. To these God can unite Himself only according to good-will. Now the question arises, why does Theodore preclude the possibility that God can unite Himself by nature to something not consubstantial with Himself? It may be remembered that Nestorius was quite violent on this point against Cyril. Theodoret and the Antiochene bishops generally were also scandalized by Cyril's "natural" or "hypostastic" union. There is every indication to believe that Theodore's reaction to Cyril's terminology would have been generally the same as that of Nestorius.

Before we examine an important text to demonstrate this point one should ask whether Theodore would have heard such language for the first time from Cyril. Of course, the answer is no. He deals with this notion at length and rejects it as being impious.⁹⁰ Also he was certainly familiar with the theology of his opponent Apollinaris who claimed that Christ is both by nature God and by nature man. On the other hand, it is quite possible that he knew St. Gregory the Theologian's letters to Cledonius attacking not only Apollinaris, but also those who divide Christ by speaking of two Sons and refusing to acknowledge the two births of the Only-Begotten Son of God, one from the Father before the ages and one "afterward of the Virgin Mary."⁹¹ In his first letter to Cledonius, Gregory speaks of the union in Christ as being according to essence.⁹²

The very fact that Theodore spends a great deal of time discussing the manner by which God dwells in Christ is an indication that he is very much aware of the metaphysical aspects of the problem. Galtier's insistence that for Theodore all this belongs to the realm of mystery

⁸⁹ *Ibid.*

⁹⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 293-294.

⁹¹ *Ep.* CII.

⁹² *Ep.* CI.

is without foundation. In his *De Incarnatione* Theodore sets out to solve the problem of the divine indwelling in Christ and never once gives the impression that it is really a mystery and therefore cannot be defined. He mentions two opinions concerning the manner of indwelling. "On the one hand some have decided that the indwelling takes place by essence and others by energy"⁹³ Theodore rejects both the Samosatene approach and the traditional approach offered in opposition to Paul of Samosata. God cannot be present in any special place according to essence because this would be a limitation of His infinity. On the other hand, if God is everywhere present by reason of His essence, granting to all the indwelling also, He would be granting this not only to men, but also to irrational and inanimate things. Since both these possibilities are improper, it is nonsense to speak of an indwelling according to nature. Neither can the indwelling take place according to energy because the providential operation of God is everywhere present. The only possibility left is to speak of God effecting His indwelling by His good-will whereby He becomes present in whom He chooses not by any spacial movement from place to place, but by will. Neither is it proper to say that God works His omnipresence by will because then He would have to work His special presence by a necessity of nature. "For thus the infinity is unto Him better preserved, when He does not appear to work by some necessity of the uncircumscribed nature. For if He is omnipresent by will, He will again be found working by necessity, no longer working the presence by opinion, but by the infinity of nature, and having the will following."⁹⁴

It should be noted at the very outset that in this passage οὐσία and φύσις are synonymous and used interchangeably. This is a clear indication that Theodore would have reacted to Cyril's ἐνώσιν κατὰ φύσιν or καθ' ὑπόστασιν exactly as he would have had Cyril spoken of an ἐνώσιν κατ' οὐσίαν. The second point which must be made clear is the fact that Theodore is not objecting to a union or presence by nature because it would primarily imply a union ordained and imposed upon the Logos from the outside as in the case of the Arian teaching. He is clearly rejecting any indwelling by nature or by essence because this implies for him an inner necessity of the divine essence itself for union with what is created. One must realize that in Theodore he is confronting a doctrine of divine relations geared to protect the divine nature from a deterministic type of pantheism, on the one hand, and

⁹³ Swete, vol. II, pp. 293-294.

⁹⁴ *Ibid.*

an unconcerned and absolutely transcendental type unmoved mover, on the other. For Theodore to allow any *κατ' οὐσίαν* union or indwelling of God in a creature would be a capitulation to Aristotelean enemies and a reversal of the Stagirite's categories of relations. For God to be related by nature to what is created would make the creature out to be the unmoved mover. Therefore, God does not work His presence in or union with creatures by nature. He only happens to be present everywhere according to essence because His nature cannot be contained by any place.⁹⁵

Underlying Theodore's concept of divine relations is a clear distinction between nature and will, which one finds again in Nestorius. This distinction is based only partly, as we shall see, on Theodore's doctrine of the Trinity. The Three Persons of the Trinity are related to each other by a necessity of nature, whereas they can be related to creatures only by will. Thus the Father is not Creator because He is Father, neither is He Father because He is Creator. He is Father because He begets His Son from His very essence, whereas He is Creator because He so wills to create. Creatures are very far from His essence, being products of the divine will. The Father is Father by nature, whereas He is Creator by will.⁹⁶

Such distinctions, so obvious in Theodore's theology, between what is in God by nature and what God does by energy and will, or between God in His Essence and God in His Glory, were common in the ancient Church^{96a} apparently for various reasons which seem to be distinguishable into three general groups:

1) The first and most primitive type of such a distinction may be found in such a writer as St. Irenaeus⁹⁷ who finds the distinction between God in Himself and God in His uncreated Glory or power in the Old Testament.⁹⁸ To see God is not to see His essence but to see Him in His glory or divinity.⁹⁹ St. Gregory the Theologian states, "... when I looked closer [behind the cloud of Mt. Sinai], I saw, not the First and unmixed Nature, known to Itself — to the Trinity, I mean; not That which abideth within the first veil, and is hidden by

⁹⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 293-296, 300, lines 26-30; Tonneau, *op. cit.*, pp. 105, 227-229.

⁹⁶ Tonneau, *op. cit.*, pp. 45-47.

^{96a} J. S. Romanides, *Τὸ προπατορικὸν ἀμάρτημα* (Athens 1957), pp. 45-51
54.

⁹⁷ *Contr. Haer.* III, 24, 2; IV, 20, 1-5ff.

⁹⁸ For similar opinions on the O.T. basis for such beliefs see A. J. Heschel
God in Search of Man (Meridian Books, N. Y. 1959) p. 80ff.

⁹⁹ Irenaeus, *op. cit.*

the Cherubim; but only that [Nature] which at last even reaches to us. And that is, as far as I can learn, the Majesty, or as holy David calls it, the Magnificence which is manifested among the creatures, which He has produced and governs. For these are the Back Parts of God, etc."¹⁰⁰ These distinctions are found also in St. Basil, St. Gregory of Nyssa and the whole Eastern tradition and presuppose a certain understanding of the prophetic experience which underlies Orthodox Triadology and Christology^{100a} and presents a definite understanding of Biblical inspiration and of the use of divine names quite foreign to Theodore's theology.

2) A second and further elaboration of the distinction between divine essence and will was clearly formulated by St. Athanasius,¹⁰¹ who relegated the generation of the Son to the essential aspect of the divine mystery, thereby rejecting all conceptual explanations, and ascribed the act of creating to the will of God. What is from the essence of the Father belongs to the very nature of God, and what is from non-being by the will of God is a creature. The Father's begetting the Son and creating the world are not the same, as the Arians claimed. Thus we believe in the Son γεννηθέντα καὶ οὐ ποιηθέντα of the Nicene Creed. St. Athanasius would go so far as to say, "As far then as the Son transcends the creature, by so much does what is by nature transcend the will."¹⁰²

3) As we have already seen, Theodore follows these Athanasian distinctions in regard to the doctrine of the Trinity. However, there are indications that this was done with some very important variations which are clearly products of a moralistic metaphysic developed primarily by certain theological groups within the geographical area of the Oriental Diocese of the Roman Empire.

Faced with the need to combat determinism in both its ethical and cosmological or philosophical forms, it seems that a Syrian theological tradition was created which emphasized the superiority of what is done according to will as over against what is done by nature. What

¹⁰⁰ *Theol. Orat.* II, 3 Here one perhaps has the ultimate source of John Scotus Eriugena's *Natura quae creat et non creatur*.

^{100a} J. S. Romanides, "H. A. Wolfson's Philosophy of the Church Fathers," in *Gr. Orth. Theol. Rev.*, Vol. 5, No. 1.

¹⁰¹ On this see G. Florovsky, "The Idea of Creation in Christian Philosophy," *The Eastern Churches Quarterly*, Vol. VIII, No. 3, Supl. (London 1949).

¹⁰² *Contr. Arian.* III, 62. Migne, P.G. 26, 453. For detailed discussion of these distinctions see St. Cyril, Thesaurus, Migne, P.G. 75, 308-313. St. Basil, P.G. 29, 673.

is done by nature can neither be praised nor rewarded nor justly punished, whereas what is done by will is indicative of a higher form of life. A man who realizes his own freedom to will what is good can occupy himself with meritorious works, on the one hand, for the reward of eternal life, and at the same time become instrumental for the betterment of society. Such a moralistic foundation would overcome the pessimism of pagan religions and philosophies and at the same time would be conducive to building up the moral stamina of the Roman Empire. Within such categories there would automatically be a strong tendency to think of divine adoption primarily as a reward which comes at the end of a process of meritorious living and the Biblical doctrine of grace and sin would become subordinated to this principle. The grace of God would not be so much a gift bestowed upon man in order to liberate him from the enemy, but a reward bestowed upon him because he has fulfilled the law. The destruction of Israel's enemies would not be the work of God's glory, but rather the work of Israel who would thereupon be rewarded with the glory of God for such meritorious efforts. Such an inversion of the Biblical pattern is perhaps the most characteristic feature of Theodore's Christology. In this respect Galtier is entirely wrong in claiming that the sole initiative for the incarnation lies with the Son of God. For Theodore, God unites Himself by will to the assumed man, but this union is dependent on God's foreknowledge of the assumed man's merits. Theodore could not imagine that one could preserve both the freedom of God and Christ otherwise.

In reading through the Catechetical Homilies one is impressed by the frequency with which the words mutability and immutability occur in connection with either the concept of sin and perfection on the one hand or the nature of God on the other. The Holy Spirit is the Spirit of Truth because Its very nature is immutable and capable of bestowing this immutability upon man. What is immutable is true and what is subject to change is falsehood.¹⁰³ Man is a sinner because of his mutable nature and because he is involved in the process of change. When he is resurrected he will receive immortality of body and immutability of the soul.¹⁰⁴ Both the mind and will of man will become conformed to the will of God and to the Truth which is the divine nature, and thus man shall partake of the divine immutability and become forever happy.¹⁰⁵

¹⁰³ Tonneau, *op. cit.*, pp. 249-255.

¹⁰⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 465.

¹⁰⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 249-255.

It seems that one is here confronting the Hellenistic idea that change and motion are either evil or negative in meaning, whereas only immutability and changelessness are of eternal significance and conducive to true security and happiness.^{105*} This of course means that freedom of choice and human activity could be for Theodore only a temporary stage to the beatific vision, which in reality is the petrification of human will and energy. Within such a frame of references human will and activity in this life are the foundation upon which one gains the merits needed for the attainment of immutability and immobility in the next life. Actually then, salvation is participation in the divine immutability whereby the nature of man and God are joined in one act of willing and knowing.

By distinguishing between what God does by will and what belongs to the divine nature Theodore is able to overcome or avoid the philosophical problem of divine relations and makes possible a reciprocal relationship between God and man. He thus lays the metaphysical foundations for a moralistic ethic which merits changelessness and immutability and happiness in the future life. It is exactly within such a context that he develops his Christology. The relationship between natures cannot be according to nature or essence since this would mean a necessary conjunction which could neither be praiseworthy nor any real moral example for anyone to follow.

The union of the two natures in Christ is effected then by goodwill and good-pleasure. However, there is in Christ a special and unique example of such a union, since there was no time when the human nature existed independently of this conjunction based on the divine foreknowledge of the assumed man's merits. Furthermore, whereas all other men have only partial participation in the grace of God, the man Jesus has a complete communion effected by the perfect conjunction of natures. Because of this conjunction there is in Christ only one will and one energy. Still, the assumed man undergoes a process of perfection which is not completed until the resurrection, when perfect immutability is attained. Starting from such presuppositions concerning the relationship between sinfulness and mutability or between perfection and immutability Theodore comes pretty close to saying that Christ was actually sinful prior to His resurrection.¹⁰⁶ The very

^{105*} J. S. Romanides, *Tò Προπατορικὸν Ἀμάρτημα*, pp. 34-42.

¹⁰⁶ Tonneau, *op. cit.*, p. 455. Similar presuppositions concerning sin and mortality are at the basis of Julian of Halicarnassus' insistence on the ἀφθαρσία of Christ's human nature before the resurrection.

existence of two wills and energies in Christ would clearly presuppose a lack of immutability on the human side and therefore some measure of imperfection and sinfulness. Therefore if there is a real conjunction of natures in Christ there must be one will and one energy. In Theodore one clearly finds a Nestorian type Monotheletism and Monenergism which perhaps goes some way to explaining its diophysite counterpart of the seventh century. There is some possibility that the presuppositions of the heresies condemned by the Sixth Ecumenical Council are to be found not so much in Monophysitism as in Nestorianism.

It seems clear enough that underlying Theodore's thought is a moralism in this life topped by a Platonic type of eudaimonia in the next. Such a concept of human destiny lacks any real understanding of the Biblical doctrine of creation and freedom and logically leads to eschatological determinism, to the *νέκρωσις* and not to the *καθάρωσις* of human will and energy. Salvation is the abolition of human freedom by the absolute submission of the will, not to the will of God, but to some sort of stiff and impersonal and motionless immutability. Thus, if Christ is perfect, He can have no natural will belonging to the very essence of human nature and differing *by the will of God* from the will of God. Nor can there be any proper activity or energy of the creature which is not a duplication of the immutable and immobile divine nature. Not to be a duplication is in reality to be sinful.

The doctrine of meritorious works in this life with the promise of reward in terms of immutability and happiness in the next, transformed into a metaphysical system concerning the nature of God and the world, seems to be at the very basis not only of Theodore's theology, but also of other heretical movements originating in the Oriental Diocese generally. That God can be related to other essences only by will and never by nature is a basic presupposition of Paul of Samosata's Christology. He claims that "the wisdom of God was not united essentially to the human element from its birth, but according to quality (*κατὰ ποιότητα*)."¹⁰⁷ In a fragment whose authenticity is doubted he says, "Different natures and different persons have one and only mode of union, accord according to will, from which appears the unit (*μονάς*) of those thus united to each other according to energy."¹⁰⁸ In Christ there is one will. "Do not be surprised that the Savior had one will with God. For as nature shows one and the same essence existing of

¹⁰⁷ Frag. IX in G. Bardy, *Paul de Samosate* (Bruges 1923), p. 326.

¹⁰⁸ *Ibid.*, frag. XXVI, p. 353.

[or in] many, thus the relationship of love accomplishes one and the same will of [or in] many by means of one and the same manifested satisfaction."¹⁰⁹ All who reach the state of eudaimonia have one willing and knowing with each other and God and thus the divine will and energy becomes the only will and energy. What is done by nature is not praiseworthy. "What prevails by reason of nature merits no praise. But what prevails by the relationship of love is praiseworthy, prevailing by one and the same energy and motion which never ceases to increase, according to which the Savior, having been conjoined to God, is never separated unto the ages, having with Him one and the same will and energy eternally moving unto the manifestation of good things."¹¹⁰ G. Bardy points out some similarities which exist between the ideas expressed in this fragment and those in Diodore of Tarsus and Theodore of Mopsuestia.¹¹¹ In this respect noteworthy is Paul's insistence that in Christ there is one will and energy, and the union of natures is effected by a relationship according to love, will, and opinion. Theodore also speaks of one energy and will in Christ and claims that the Logos is in the man "according to the relationship of opinion"¹¹² or the Logos united the man to Himself "by the relationship of opinion."¹¹³

The philosophical problems involved in the doctrine of divine relationships did not obviously present Paul of Samosata with serious difficulty as far as the doctrine of the Trinity is concerned, since the divine Persons were for him unhypostatic energies.¹¹⁴ However, the application of the category of necessity or necessary being to the divine nature and the preservation of the real relations of God toward creation by the above mentioned philosophical distinction between nature and will, or between what God does by a necessity of nature and what He does by will, automatically introduces difficulties not only into Christology, but also into the doctrine of the Holy Trinity, especially when the hypostatic character of the Persons is admitted. Is the Father related to the hypostatic Logos by nature or by will? In order to preclude Valentinian type of necessary emanations and Manichaean divisions of the divine nature Arius and his followers insisted on a relationship of will.¹¹⁵ There can be no essential relationship of the two. There

¹⁰⁹ *Ibid.*, frag. XXVIII, p. 354.

¹¹⁰ *Ibid.*, frag. XXIX, p. 355.

¹¹¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 355-357.

¹¹² Swete, p. 310, lines 20-21.

¹¹³ *Ibid.*, p. 308, lines 16-17.

¹¹⁴ Frag. XV, *op. cit.*, p. 335.

¹¹⁵ See Arius' letters to Eusebius and Alexander in G. Bardy, *Recherches sur Saint Lucien d'Antioche et Son Ecole* (Paris 1936), pp. 226-228, 235-237. Cf. frag. of the Thalia, pp. 256-257, 262-263.

is no reason to suspect any sophistical trick in the Arian claim that "Unless He has by will come to be, therefore God had a Son by necessity and against His good pleasure."¹¹⁶ For the Arians, as for Paul, Theodore and Nestorius, what is by nature is by necessity.

The Orthodox answer to this Arian objection is quite clear. Necessity is contrary to will, while what is according to nature is far above will and completely beyond the conceptual powers of man. No logical categories or concepts can be applied to the unknown nature of God. The Arians have no right to apply the categories of necessity and will to the divine nature. "Forgetting, however, that they are hearing about God's Son, they dare to apply human contrarities in the instance of God, 'necessity' and 'beside purpose,' to be able thereby to deny that there is a true Son of God. For let them tell us themselves, that God is good and merciful, does this attach to Him by will or not? If by will, we must consider that He began to be good, and that His not being good is possible; for to council and choose implies an inclination two ways, and is incidental to a rational nature. But if it be too unseemly that He should be called good and merciful upon will, then let them hear what they themselves have said — 'therefore by necessity and not at His pleasure He is good'; and, 'who is it that imposes this necessity on Him?' But if it be unseemly to speak of necessity in the case of God, and therefore it is by nature that He is good, much more is He, and more truly, Father of the Son by nature and not by will."¹¹⁷ The Holy Trinity is the pre-existing primordial reality, but beyond all concepts of reality, necessity and being. God is certainly free, but not in any moralistic sense of opposition between what is by necessity of nature and what is by will. God is what He is by nature and not by any necessity or will. God is not free by will, but by His very nature. He is not subject to the moralistic metaphysics of any moralistic philosophy as imagined by both Arians and Nestorians. St. Cyril devotes much time to a refutation of the Arians on this point in his work "On the Consubstantial Trinity,"¹¹⁸ written before the outbreak of the Nestorian Controversy. St. Gregory the Theologian writes, "Let us not

¹¹⁶ St. Athanasius, *Contr. Arian.* III, 62. Migne, *P.G.* 26, 453B.

¹¹⁷ *Ibid.*, 453C-456A. Cf. 63, 64, 65, 66, 67. It is interesting to note that these same principles were debated between Monothelites and Orthodox in the seventh century and this adds substance to our suspicion that the Nestorian moralistic metaphysic lies at the basis of the heresies condemned at the Sixth Council. See e.g. St. Maximus, *Disputatio cum Pyrrho*, Migne, *P.G.* 91, 293. This passage is discussed by H. A. Wolfson, *op. cit.*, p. 485.

¹¹⁸ Migne, *P.G.* 75, 773ff.

ever look on this generation as involuntary, like some natural overflow, hard to be retained.”¹¹⁹

One may add at this point that salvation is not a matter of doing good things by will as opposed to the necessities of nature, but rather a renewal of the natural freedom of human nature itself. The doctrine of human will as distinguished from the necessary or natural appetites of human nature can be justified only within a moralistic complex in which correct choices in this life lead to the reward of happiness and motionless satisfaction in the next, which in reality is a final victory of what is taken as the necessary drive toward the contemplation of immutable realities. Motion and change are only of temporary significance and enable man freely to choose the exchange of his freedom of will for happiness. However, in the Orthodox tradition this is pure rubbish and leads to Monotheletism and Monenergism unless the perfection of Christ's human nature is sacrificed. Man's destiny is not happiness, but natural freedom. In Christ there was no “deliberative will” ($\vartheta\epsilon\eta\mu\alpha\gamma\gamma\omega\mu\iota\circ\sigma$), but a “natural will” ($\vartheta\epsilon\eta\mu\alpha\varphi\omega\iota\circ\sigma$) and “natural freedom.” In His human nature Christ was not free by an act of will. He was free by His very nature. Therefore, He really had or has two natural wills and energies, divine and human, without any connotation of sinfulness. For Platonized forms of Christianity, which understand the fall of man in terms of lack of happiness and immutability, this is not possible. Purity and sinlessness in the Bible are not immobility of a satisfied mind and will conjoined to immutable realities, but rather the freedom of the heart or, in modern terms, of the sub-conscious. A person can will good things all he wants, but unless his heart or sub-conscious is purified by the grace or glory of God, his works are of no avail and he is still a captive to demonic influences. Willful good works which are not products of a heart being purified by divine grace are not only not meritorious, but, much worse, they are satanic. Good works produced by a filthy sub conscious and a rationalistic self-justifying self assertiveness can be nothing else.

¹¹⁹ *Theol. Orat.* XXIX, 2 Migne, PG 36, 76BC. That God is related to creatures by will and not by nature (except in the Incarnation) is in Orthodox patristic theology a statement of fact, or a confession of faith, and not the outcome of applying metaphysical concepts to the divine nature. There is a real distinction between $\gamma\epsilon\pi\pi\mu\alpha$ and $\epsilon\kappa\tau\omega\mu\epsilon\mu\iota\sigma$, on the one hand, and $\vartheta\epsilon\iota\circ\sigma$, $\epsilon\pi\epsilon\gamma\mu\iota\sigma$, $\pi\mu\iota\mu\iota\sigma$, on the other, not because of a distinction between what is by necessity and what is by will, but because of the Biblical distinction between what is un-created and what is created. If there were no difference between $\gamma\epsilon\pi\pi\mu\alpha$ and $\vartheta\epsilon\iota\circ\sigma$ (or $\pi\mu\iota\mu\iota\sigma$, etc.), then either the Son would be a creature, or creatures would be uncreated and eternal.

One can get a good glimpse into an aspect of the metaphysical background of Arianism and Nestorianism by turning to some interesting documents attributed to St. Justin Martyr and dated between the middle of the fourth and the first half of the fifth centuries.¹²⁰ These works definitely belong geographically to the Syrian province and are strongly Nestorian in tendency. The idea that the Logos works by essence his special presence in Christ, His Temple, is rejected.¹²¹ The special presence takes place in Christ rather in the sense that being the purest of all temples He has the greatest degree possible of participation "not in divine nature but in divine honor by the good-will of the Logos."¹²² This union is likened unto participation in the rays of the sun which shine equally on all. Yet the purer and more powerful the contemplating eye the more perfect and complete is the participation. In this sense is the Logos present in His own Temple in a special manner.¹²³ He cannot be especially present in Christ by nature since He happens to be by essence everywhere present¹²⁴

In another document evidently by the same author one comes across the following: "If God creates by nature, He creates whatever He creates by necessity. But if He creates by will, He creates authoritatively. Creating authoritatively, He creates as much as He wills and whatever He wills and whenever He wills"¹²⁵ In another work of this same collection we find the following question and answer: "If to be in potentiality is considered inferior to being in actuality, how does the Creator of the world, being Creator in potentiality and not in actuality before the creation of the world, not fall under the title of inferiority? The answer: They whose power of act is determined by some natural necessity are those whose power is considered inferior to the Act. Whosoever's power of act is determined by will and not by some natural necessity is not in the category of inferiority"¹²⁶ It is quite strange that having such presuppositions, this same author accepts the essential relationship of the three divine Hypostases¹²⁷ What

¹²⁰ B Altaner, *op cit*, pp 369 370, 397-398

¹²¹ Ἐρθεσις δρθῆς ὁμολογιας 17

¹²² *Ibid*, 15

¹²³ *Ibid*, 17. Cf. 12ff.

¹²⁴ *Ibid* Leontius of Byzantium accuses Nestorius of thinking of the divine nature as though it were an infinite expanse unable to be contained in any place. Leontius argues that spatial concepts are not applicable to God and it is foolish to think that the divine essence occupies space like a sort of continuous quantity. Migne, PG 86, 1401-1413 Cf Georges Florovsky, *op cit*

¹²⁵ Ἐρωτήσεις Χριστιανικαὶ III, 2

¹²⁶ Ἀπογρισεις προς Ὀοθοδόξους 114

¹²⁷ Ἐρθεσις δρθῆς ὁμολογιας 19

type of answer could he have given to the Arian objections to the generation by necessity? It is perhaps not surprising that his language in places indicates that he may have been a converted Arian who had not completely overcome his former way of thinking. The Logos and Spirit are God by participation and are deemed worthy of divinity. He writes for example: "For since the Father begat the Son from His proper essence, and from the same [essence] projected the Spirit, naturally (εἰκότως) partaking of one and the same essence, they were deemed worthy of one and the same divinity (τῆς αὐτῆς καὶ μαζὸς θεότητος ἡξιώνται)."¹²⁸

It seems clear enough that once the moralistic metaphysical distinction between what God is by a necessity of nature and what He does by will is introduced into the field of Biblical theology one is immediately caught up into the Samosatene, Arian and Nestorian problematics concerning the divine relations. That these were vital problems for the theologians of the Oriental Diocese should not be surprising to the modern theologian, especially to anyone familiar with the contradictions of the Thomistic system, which is forced to deny any real relationship of God toward creation in order to avoid pantheism. The Orthodox Fathers of the Church refused to apply any categories or names to the divine essence, let alone the category of necessary being, and thereby could freely speak of the Logos uniting Himself by nature to human nature in order to emphasize the reality of the incarnation of One of the hypostatic Persons of the Trinity. Of course the terms "hypostatic union" and "natural union" are not definitions of what is a complete mystery. The divine essence is by its very nature radically unknown to any creature. "Natural union" can therefore only mean a "real union." This the Nestorians could not accept because for them it would mean a defined and determined union which would destroy the very basis of their moralistic ethics of merits and rewards and deprive their type of anti-deterministic metaphysic of its very foundations. It is only when one realizes this essential point that he can fully grasp the violent Nestorian reaction to Cyril's "natural and hypostatic union."

Theodoret argued that this cannot be because "nature is something necessary and without will."¹²⁹ Cyril takes him to task for daring to apply such a category to the divine nature.¹³⁰ The Oriental bishops see in this term a recurrence of the Apollinarin heresy. Natures work by

¹²⁸ *Ibid.*, 2.

¹²⁹ Migne, P.G. 76, 401.

¹³⁰ *Ibid.*, 408.

necessity only when created by God to function in a predetermined manner. God operates not by necessity but by will or grace.¹³¹ Exactly in this respect the Orientals agree with the Arians in principle. God cannot unite Himself by nature to creatures. For the Arians this is proof that the Logos is a creature because united by the will of his creator to human nature in such a way that the union is natural and predetermined from without. For the Syrians the Logos cannot be united by nature to His Temple because He is God. Nestorius is, of course, the classical exponent of these presuppositions. "A voluntary union cannot be a natural union. If then they say that the union of the natures resulted in one nature, even though we ourselves should concede to them that it took place voluntarily, yet after it took place, the union existed not voluntarily in that the natures have acquired it. And it suffers as being united, whether it will or not, and accepts the sufferings of that nature to which it has been united, since it is defined by it and not by impassability nor by immortality nor by infinity. For the definition and circumscription of all nature is that in which it has to be."¹³² It is quite obvious that Nestorius is a stranger to the Orthodox patristic apophaticism which denies any application of definitions or concepts to the divine nature.

As we have seen, Theodore is also involved in the general Oriental metaphysical scheme with its peculiar reduction of God to the categories of necessary being as opposed to what God does by will. What is by nature is by necessity. "The reason of union according to essence is true only in the case of consubstantials, but in the case of things not consubstantial it is not applicable, there being no clear (reason) possible for confusion."¹³³ Theodore accepts the principle that metaphysical rules and concepts can be applied to the divine nature. Apart from the unique exception in the case of the Divine Consustantials God can be united and related to non consubstantials only by energy and goodwill. "For thus the infinity is unto Him better preserved, when He does not appear to work by some necessity of the uncircumscribed nature. For if He is omnipresent by will, He will again be found working by necessity, no longer working the presence by opinion, but by the infinity of nature, and having the will following."¹³⁴

¹³¹ *Ibid.*, 325

¹³² G. R. Driver and L. Hodgson, *The Bazaar of Heracleides* (Oxford 1925), p. 38

¹³³ Swete, vol. II, pp. 338-339

¹³⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 293-294

The last point we wish to make regards Theodore's Biblical method and especially his doctrine of inspiration. In this respect he differs radically from the central Orthodox patristic tradition and has points of contact with the Eunomeans and the traditional fundamentalism of Western theology. Perhaps Theodore's understanding of prophecy and inspiration explains more than anything else his metaphysical approach to Christology. There are two specific doctrines of inspiration which concern us here, the one which believes that God actually dictated words to those who were objects of His revelations, and the other which believes that God revealed His uncreated Glory and Will to the prophets and apostles who in turn transposed their suprarational and suprasentient experience into the idiom established by the prophetic tradition to convey their message in direct proportion to the spiritual capacities and needs of the various levels of people addressed.

a) One of the best examples of a fundamentalistic literalist doctrine of inspiration in the Ancient Church is that of Eunomius¹³⁵ who believed that the very names of things exist eternally in the mind of God and constitute the very definitions of essences. Besides these uncreated names and determinations of creatures there are also eternal and uncreated names of God which are revealed in Scripture and constitute definitions of the divine nature. One can see clearly the intimate connection between the Eunomean doctrines of God and Biblical Inspiration. Since the names "Father" and "Unbegottenness" are eternal definitions of the divine essence, it follows that the names "Son" and "Begottenness" must be designations of another and created essence.

b) In direct opposition to Eunomius, St. Gregory of Nyssa rejects the contention that names are eternal and insists that all words and languages are products of human accommodations to the necessities of communication on the human level, and all concepts either conveyed by words or simply contemplated can never extricate themselves from their creaturely qualities. Knowledge of God, therefore, cannot be conceptual. God cannot be reached by contemplation. God is not like anything man experiences either intellectually or by sensation. Knowledge of God can come only by revelation and knowledge *about* God can be had only from those who have been the objects of this revelation, which is above all rational and sentient categories. It is a knowledge which can be indicated but not conveyed by human language or concepts. He who has been graced with revelation can only point to

¹³⁵ His views may be found developed and refuted in St. Gregory of Nyssa's *Second Book Against Eunomius*. Migne, P.G. 45, 909-1122, especially 973 ff.

the Glory of God. *Only God can reveal His proper Glory to whom He chooses.* This is why Christ revealed His Own Proper Glory which is at once His and the Father's. The Bible, therefore, is not inspired because dictated verbally by God, but because either written by or about those who have and are encountering God in His Self-revelation which is not a conveyance of words and images.¹³⁶ St. Gregory writes, "Neither, then, did God speak in the Hebrew language, nor did He express Himself according to any form in use among the Gentiles. But whatsoever of God's words are recorded by Moses or the Prophets, are indications of the Divine will, illuminating, now in one way, now in another, the pure intellect of those holy men, according to the measure of grace of which they were partakers. Moses, then, spoke his mother-tongue, and that in which he was educated. But he repeatedly attributed these words to God, as I have said, on account of the immaturity of those who were being brought to the knowledge of God, in order to give a clear representation of the divine will, and to render his hearers more obedient, as being awed by the authority of the speaker."¹³⁷ It is only in the New Testament that one confronts actual human words of the Incarnate Logos, but even these words are not uncreated definitions of eternal truths. They are the pedagogical means which point the way to seeing the Ruling Power of God which is beyond all concepts and forms, yet made manifest in the human nature of the Logos.

As we have already seen, Theodore of Mopsuestia follows the Eunomean interpretive method of applying the Biblical names of God to the divine nature. He also seems to follow the Eunomeans in their contention that God revealed words to the prophets. Theodore explains that God operated His revelation upon the prophets in such a way that the impression was created upon them that they were hearing someone speak, ὥστε δοκεῖν αὐτοῖς ὥσπερ τινὸς λαλοῦντος ἀκούειν τε καὶ παιδεύεσθαι, οὕτω τε δέχεσθαι τῶν ἀναγκαίων τὴν γνῶσιν . . . ἐπειδὴ ὥσπερ τινὸς λέγοντος ἀκούειν ἔδοκει.¹³⁸ In another passage¹³⁹ Theodore seems to be repeating the divine language theories of Eunomius. He explains that Moses does not record God's saying anything in the first instance of creation ("In the beginning God created the heavens and the

¹³⁶ Deut. 4, 15; Acts 1, 19.

¹³⁷ *Op. cit.*, 997D.

¹³⁸ Devreesse, *op. cit.*, p. 81, n. 5. H. Kihn, *Theodor von Mopsuestia und Julius Africanus als Exegeten*, Freiburg 1880, p. 107. For a history of the Church's attitude toward Theodore's theories about the Bible see L. Piro, *L'oeuvre exégétique de Théodore de Mopsueste*, 1913.

¹³⁹ Devreesse, *op. cit.*, p. 9, n. 2. H. Kihn, *op. cit.*, p. 109 f.

earth") because there were as yet no creatures (angels) to reap any benefit from such verbal instruction. Once angels did come into existence then God began to speak for their sake since His essence was to them invisible. Had He not spoken they would have remained without proper knowledge of their Creator. Theodore is here attacking St. Basil who believes that the angels were created before heaven and earth. In other words, if St. Basil were correct the Bible should read, "God said, Let there be heaven and earth." St. Gregory of Nyssa had already anticipated Theodore on this in his refutation of Eunomius' similar understanding of Genesis, where God is pictured as speaking and applying already existing names to the things He is creating.¹⁴⁰

It is interesting to note that according to the Mopsuestian the angels were in need of divine speech for instruction since they could not see the divine essence. To understand what he means by this one must recall the fact that for Theodore those saved do have a vision of and conjunction with the divine nature when rewarded with immutability and happiness in the next life. This means that Theodore is referring to the angels before the fall. To have had the vision of the divine nature from the very beginning would contradict the Mopsuestian's moralistic metaphysics. Vision of the divine nature at creation would mean perfect satisfaction, happiness and immutability from the very beginning and no logical possibility for a fall.¹⁴¹ This would upset the scheme of the Antiochene moralism described above since there would be no distinction between what is by nature and what is by will and angels would be completely happy and immutable by nature. The same would be true for man. Otherwise the whole structure of merits and rewards would tumble. The vision of God in His uncreatedness would be putting the reward before the accumulation of merits and would make the fall logically impossible. Hence the extreme importance for God to communicate His Will to angels and men by the medium of words, concepts and created impressions. The fact that the impression of hearing a voice is an inward experience and not something imposed on the senses from without does not absolve Theodore of the charge of having an anthropomorphic understanding of revelation, as H. Kihn believes.¹⁴² For God to speak to prophets from without or from within is substantially the same thing

¹⁴⁰ *Op. cit.*

¹⁴¹ Augustine and the scholastic tradition generally accepted at least a partial vision of the divine essence from the very beginning and were thus faced with such a problem. See e.g. Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologica*, I, 94, 1. J. S. Romanides, Τὸ Προπατορικὸν Ἀμάρτημα, p. 112, n. 2.

¹⁴² *Op. cit.*, p. 110 ff.

since in both instances God is conveying and the prophet is receiving words

It naturally follows from Theodore's moralistic metaphysics that the prophetic claim to seeing God in His uncreated Glory would be relegated to the realm of divinely inspired imagination. This is exactly how he explains Isaiah's claim to have seen God "When Isaiah says he saw God and the Seraphim, he also heard voices coming toward him. For this reason he sometimes says, The word of the Lord which was upon so and so, meaning by word the energy by which he believed he was learning what was fitting, being taught by a certain voice, and at other times (he says) vision, which he saw here or there, meaning by this the revelation, according to which, believing to see something (όραν τι δούων), he learned what was proper."¹⁴³ Seeing the glory of God is no more than an imaginary process, even though produced by divine inspiration. The cause of this revelation is uncreated, but the effect is a created impression of voices and visions.

This understanding of seeing the Glory of God is from the Orthodox patristic viewpoint sheer heresy, but on the other hand much more refined than the grossly superstitious concept of Augustine which became common in the West and in the person of Barlaam the Calabrian was finally condemned by the Palamite Council of 1341.¹⁴⁴ According to Augustine what the prophets and apostles saw was not anything uncreated,¹⁴⁵ since for him the very substance of God is alone uncreated and visible only in the next life (with the possible exception

¹⁴³ *Ibid*, p 107 Devreesee, *op cit*, p 81, n 5 L Pirot, *op cit*, p 169 f

¹⁴⁴ In opposition to the Augustinian type doctrine of revelation held by Barlaam the Calabrian, who believed that the glory of God as manifested in such instances as the Transfiguration was created and served only to elevate minds deprived of purity and intellectual understanding to the grasping of the divine ideas (λογισ τῶν θεοειδῶν — a strong indication that Barlaam was not in the nominalist tradition which rejects the existence of divine forms, — *αναγωγὴ ἀπὸ τοῦ τοιούτου φωτὸς ἐπὶ ιοηματα γαὶ θεοειδηματα*), the Constantinopolitan Council of 1341 declared with the Greek Fathers that the Glory of God revealed to the prophets and apostles is none other than the Uncreated Godhead (not essence) and in pronouncing on the Church's doctrine of revelation quoted St Dionysius the Areopagite who writes, 'Ιωάννην παραλαμβάνει ὡς τῆς θεού ογιας παρθενον καὶ παθαρωτατον ὄργανον ὅπως την ἀγρον δοξαν τού Τιοῦ θεασαμενος, «ἐν ἀρχῇ ἦν ὁ Λογος, γαὶ ὁ Λογος ἦν προς τον Θεον, γαὶ Θεος ἦν ὁ Λογος», βροντήσει. J Karmiris, *The Dogmatic and Symbolic Monuments of the Orthodox Catholic Church*, Athens 1952, vol 1, p 302

¹⁴⁵ *De Trinitate*, II, v, 10, vi, 11, viii, 14, ix, 16, x, 17, 18, xiii, 23, xiv, 24, xv, 25, 26, xvi, 26 (Glory which Moses saw is creature), xvii, 32, xviii, 35, III, pref, 3, iv, 10, x, 21 xi, 22, 24, 26, 27

of the ecstatic visions of Moses and Paul). Rather, in seeing the glory of God the prophets saw and heard created things which temporarily came into existence and passed away and received their revelations (visions and words) by means of these creatures.¹⁴⁶ Thus from the Old Testament viewpoint Augustine and his followers "changed the Glory of the incorruptible God for the likeness of an image of corruptible man." (Rom. 1:23). As for Theodore so for Augustine the vision of God comes at the end of all actions, since the contemplation of the divine substance means satisfaction of all desires, i.e. happiness and immutability. "For this contemplation is held forth to us as the end of all actions, and the everlasting fullness of joy. . . . For we shall not seek anything else when we shall have come to the contemplation of Him."¹⁴⁷ So long as man is involved in mutability and mortality it is impossible for him to see God. In his present condition man can see only changeable things.¹⁴⁸ Augustine and Theodore seem to be in perfect accord.

For the Biblical writers, however, for the so-called Asia Minor School, for Justin, for the Alexandrian Theologians, for the Cappadocians, for Hilary of Poitiers, and for the Orthodox patristic tradition generally, to see the Glory of God does not belong to the realm of divinely inspired imagination or Augustinian wonder-working. Rather it is a real and actual vision of God enthroned upon His Uncreated Majesty. The Glory of God is His very Throne, Power, Kingdom (βασιλεία), the Unapproachable Light in which He eternally dwells. God is the "King and Lord of Glory" which alone can be known to creatures both in this life and the next, when God will be seen as He is. In spite of the partial and limited character of the prophetic and apostolic experience of seeing the Majesty of God, it is still the very Uncreated Glory that they saw *before* they parted this life. The Glory of God is His Godhead (not essence) and Ruling Power by which He saves Israel from her enemies and the Church from the rule of Satan.

¹⁴⁶ *Ibid.*

¹⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, I, viii, 17.

¹⁴⁸ ". . . there is nothing that is visible that is not changeable. Wherefore the substance, or, if it is better to say, the essence of God, wherein we understand, in proportion to our measure, in however small a degree, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, since it is in no way changeable, can in no way in its proper self be visible. It is manifest, accordingly, that all those appearances to the fathers, when God was presented to them according to His own dispensation, suitable to the times, were wrought through the creature." *Ibid.*, III, x, 21-xi, 22. This does not mean that the wise man in this life is divorced from "unchangeable wisdom," for "his rational soul is already partaker of the unchangeable and eternal truth. . . ." *Ibid.*, III, iii, 8.

The miracles and resurrection of Christ only point to this Glory of God and by themselves could never have demonstrated more than the fact that God was acting in the man Jesus. The climax of New Testament Revelation is the fact that He who was born of the Virgin and is Son of David revealed the Uncreated Glory of His Father as His own natural and proper Glory, and thereby revealed His proper Godhead. "Light . . . was That Godhead Which was shewn upon the Mount [of transfiguration] to the disciples — and a little too strong for their eyes."¹⁴⁹ The Primitive Christians did not come to believe in the Godhead of Christ by a hit and miss process. Rather the Apostles and many others *saw and continue to see* (God is not only He Who Acted, but He Who Acts) the Godhead or Glory of Christ. The Apostles learned by experience that Christ is the "Lord of Glory," the very same "King of Glory" Who revealed Himself to the Old Testament prophets (John 12, 41). It is exactly because he was confronted by the Glory of Christ that St. Paul learned to speak of the Crucified Lord of Glory (I Cor. 2, 8).

The Biblical writers and the Orthodox Fathers were not hampered in recognizing the reality of the Old and New Testament Theophanies because of any Hellenistic and moralistic doctrine of human destiny. Man's destiny is not immutability of mind and will by a Platonic contemplation of immutable truths. The destiny of man is freedom. Neither are works meritorious.¹⁵⁰ Besides, the wicked will also come to the knowledge of Truth¹⁵¹ by seeing the Uncreated Glory of God, but to them God will be a consuming fire, the eternal fire of hell (Lk. 16:19-31). For platonized forms of Christian intellectualism this would be impossible.¹⁵² Hence the ideas of hell entertained by some traditions for whom the vision of God could only mean happiness.

Both Augustine and Theodore of Mopsuestia reject the Old Testament revelatory and epistemological foundation of New Testament Christology and Triadology.¹⁵³ However, the bishop of Hippo

¹⁴⁹ *Oration on Holy Baptism*, VI. Migne, P.G. 36, 365A.

¹⁵⁰ J. S. Romanides, *op. cit.*, p. 109-111.

¹⁵¹ Father G. Florovsky deals with the example of Maximus the Confessor in *The Resurrection of Life, Ingersoll Lecture*, Harvard University, 1950-1951, p. 20.

¹⁵² "And what is life eternal, unless that sight which is not granted to the ungodly?" St. Augustine, *op. cit.*, I, xiii, 30.

¹⁵³ For other brief discussions of this foundation see my articles *H. A. Wolff's Philosophy of the Church Fathers*, mentioned above, and "Justin Martyr and the Fourth Gospel," in *Gr. Orth. Theol. Rev.*, Winter 1958-59, Vol. IV, No. 2, pp. 115-134. It should be further noted that because he rejected the

had a legalistic and authoritarian understanding of the Church's dogmas, accepting them at first on faith, and then trying hard the rest of his life to understand them conceptually by contemplation. In the Orthodox tradition there is also a distinction between faith and knowledge, but knowledge is here the vision of and participation in God's Glory, not the contemplation of the eternal and immutable ideas of Plato. "Attack the ideas of Plato," says St. Gregory the Theologian to the Eunomians.¹⁵⁴ In contrast to Augustine, Theodore of Mopsu-

Biblical fact that God revealed Himself in His Uncreated Glory and because he conceived of God as absolute simplicity and being, Augustine quite naturally identified God with His Essence, Will and Ruling Power. These being identical, it was unavoidable that (1) he confuse the divine energy of sending or bestowing the Spirit or the grace of the Spirit with the procession of the Spirit and (2) distort the Patristic doctrine of the radical incommunicability of the Hypostatic Attributes. Thus he became the source of *Filioque*. The Nestorianizing theologians of the East were immune to this because they clearly distinguished between divine essence and energy and adhered to the incommunicability of the Hypostatic Attributes. Furthermore, for Augustine the Divine Essence must be the object of human knowledge. Otherwise there would be no knowledge of God since all else that exists is created. Augustine accepts the Arian and Eunomian axiom that to know a thing is to know its substance. "But nothing is at all rightly said to be known while its substance is not known." *De Trinitate* X, x, 16. To know God is to know at least in part the divine essence. Since Its vision is impossible in this life and since seeing God's Glory is to see a creature, the surest road from faith to knowledge is that of piety, Bible study and most important contemplation. Creatures are reflections of their immutable divine prototypes and Scripture is a heaven sent clarification of these eternal ideas. Therefore, both creatures and Scripture help one to contemplate by analogies and likenesses these unchangeable and eternal truth-ideas in God. It is exactly because the traditions following Augustine lost contact with the prophetic, apostolic and patristic vision of God's Uncreated Glory that the problem of Universals became so important. The Nominalists and to some extent the Protestants rejected the Universals and were left with a Bible of Augustinian wonder-working. Amazing is the exploratory way in which Augustine wrote his *De Trinitate*. Upon reaching Book Three he writes, "I myself confess that I have by writing learned many things which I did not know." One should compare this with *Oration XXVII* of St. Gregory the Theologian. In Book II Augustine promises to explain the procession of the Holy Spirit. This promise along with other parts of the work was stolen by friends and published. Finally when Augustine was nearing the end of this work he mentions in Book XV that he had promised to explain the procession of the Holy Spirit but admits that he "had attained to endeavor rather than accomplishment." Beyond any doubt the most ironic tragedy in history is that Western Theologians and finally an illusionist papacy turned Augustine's endeavor into an infallible accomplishment and brought about the final touches of a separation which was long in the making. What is almost equally as tragic is that a sober Protestant theologian can even today say that "it is this [the *Filioque*] which the poor folk in the Eastern Church have never quite understood. . . ." K. Barth, *Dogmatics in Outline*, p. 44.

¹⁵⁴ *Oration XXVII*, 10, Migne, P.G. 36, 24B.

estia was not so much limited by an obedience to an ecclesiastical authority as he was by the metaphysical principles in the air of his theological environment. In view of his understanding of the Old Testament Theophanies and because of his Antiochene metaphysical concept of God and his Hellenistic understanding of human destiny, it is no wonder that St. Paul's crucified Lord of Glory had not the slightest effect in conditioning his Christology. If the Lord of Glory was crucified in His humanity, He was certainly born as man in His humanity, so that He Who was born of the Virgin is consubstantial with the Father, and Mary is Theotokos with no Nestorian strings attached. The very idea of a man becoming or being Lord of Glory by adoption is sheer nonsense, if not as blasphemous as worshiping an adopted man. That the Old Testament Messiah is the anointed of God is a statement of fact which does not abrogate the reality that the King of Glory humbled and emptied Himself in becoming Son of David and anointed King of Israel. St. Cyril of Alexandria over and over again uses St. Paul's Crucified Lord of Glory in expounding Biblical Christology. However, this did not make the slightest dent in the rationalistic metaphysical mind of Nestorius who no doubt held opinions about the Old Testament vision of the Lord of Glory and Biblical inspiration similar to those of Theodore.

The opinion generally prevails that Theodore's Christology is based on an inductive historico-biblical method which begins by recognizing the full humanity of Christ and tries from this point to solve the problem of the unity of subject in Christ. This is clearly a myth. Theodore, like many others of the Oriental Diocese, is a moralistic metaphysician who applies concepts and definitions to the divine nature and in advance determines what is for God possible and what is not. According to his doctrine of divine relations it is impossible for God to unite Himself by nature to human nature. His starting point is not the human nature of Christ, nor is it the biblical witness as history, but rather a definition and limitation of divine nature in terms of a necessity distinguished from will. It is exactly because of this transcendental starting point that Theodore's doctrine of the Trinity has no room for any real distinction between hypostasis and essence. In Cappadocian and Alexandrian Triadology the reality of the Divine Hypostases as distinguished from the divine essence is grounded in the belief that the Second Hypostasis of the Trinity really and truly lived and willed and suffered as a real and complete man and that He really and truly was resurrected in the flesh to become the first-born from the dead.¹⁵⁵ For Theodore there is no

¹⁵⁵ Father Florovsky always protests against the prevailing notion that the East one-sidedly contemplates the doctrine of the Trinity whereas the West con-

need to distinguish between the hypostasis of the Logos and the nature of the Logos because the one person effected by the union of natures not only is not the Only-Begotten Son of God, as Sullivan clearly demonstrates, but also *cannot* be an hypostasis of the Trinity. Natural or hypostatic union is for Theodore a necessary union. There can be no doubt that Theodore would have wholeheartedly supported the attack on St. Cyril. Whether he would have changed his mind about the double consubstantiality of the One and Unique Hypostasis born of the Virgin when faced by the decision of the Fourth Ecumenical Council one can never know. On the other hand one can not preclude the very strong possibility that Theodore may have remained more faithful to Nestorius than did Theodoret and the other Antiochenes.

There are solid enough reasons for believing that the Fifth Ecumenical Council had no business condemning Theodore who had died in communion with the Church, but there are no reasons for putting forth the notion that this was made possible by some kind of reversal to a one-sided Cyrilianism or neo-chalcedonianism which supposedly upset the balance of strict chalcedonianism. The dogmatic decisions of the Fifth Council are no different from those of Chalcedon and any claim that Theodore passes the test of chalcedonian Christology is unrealistic. C. Moeller is no doubt correct when he claims that the anathemas of the Fifth Council are strange to modern Roman sensitivities. If he and other Roman theologians studied more carefully the Christology of Chalcedon and the Triadology of the First and Second Councils, they would further discover that their theology is not in accord with these either, especially in regard to the Biblical doctrine of Revelation and Grace which underlies all Orthodox Patristic Theology.

HOLY CROSS

GREEK ORTHODOX THEOLOGICAL SCHOOL

centrates on the humanity of Christ. He constantly points out that the Eastern doctrine of the Trinity is grounded in Christology which is always the starting point of all its theology.



Copyright and Use:

As an ATLAS user, you may print, download, or send articles for individual use according to fair use as defined by U.S. and international copyright law and as otherwise authorized under your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement.

No content may be copied or emailed to multiple sites or publicly posted without the copyright holder(s)' express written permission. Any use, decompiling, reproduction, or distribution of this journal in excess of fair use provisions may be a violation of copyright law.

This journal is made available to you through the ATLAS collection with permission from the copyright holder(s). The copyright holder for an entire issue of a journal typically is the journal owner, who also may own the copyright in each article. However, for certain articles, the author of the article may maintain the copyright in the article. Please contact the copyright holder(s) to request permission to use an article or specific work for any use not covered by the fair use provisions of the copyright laws or covered by your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement. For information regarding the copyright holder(s), please refer to the copyright information in the journal, if available, or contact ATLA to request contact information for the copyright holder(s).

About ATLAS:

The ATLA Serials (ATLAS®) collection contains electronic versions of previously published religion and theology journals reproduced with permission. The ATLAS collection is owned and managed by the American Theological Library Association (ATLA) and received initial funding from Lilly Endowment Inc.

The design and final form of this electronic document is the property of the American Theological Library Association.

century; the confirmation by the Seventh Ecumenical Council of previous councils which dealt with the canon of the Holy Scriptures, such as Laodicia and Trullo, indicate that the Church stands unanimous in favor of the canonicity of these books.

The fact that there was a tendency among certain Fathers to use the Hebrew canon instead of the Septuagint does not overthrow the prevalent position of the Church. The conscience of the Church has accepted them as canonical. It is true however, that from the theoretical point of view, *de iure* the position of the Church is not crystal clear; there is no specific canon by an Ecumenical Council which speaks about the canonicity of these books. But *de facto* there is no doubt about their canonical status in the Church. As such it may be the task of the Church to make them formally canonical in the forthcoming Pan-Orthodox Synod.

Contemporary Greek Orthodox scholars are specific about this subject. Practically all of them accept their canonicity. See for example: P. I. Bratsiotis, *Introduction to the Old Testament* (Athens, 1937), pp. 518-519; Christos Androutsos, *Dogmatics of Orthodox Eastern Church* (2nd Ed. Athens, 1956), pp. 3-5; P. I. Bratsiotis, *An Epitome Introduction to the Old Testament* (Athens, 1955), pp. 253-256; Vasilios Vellas, *The Holy Scripture in the Greek Orthodox Church* (Athens, 1958), pp. 5-6; Ioannis Karmires, *Synopsis of the Dogmatical Teaching of the Orthodox Catholic Church* (Athens, 1957), pp. 10-11; P. N. Trembelas, *Dogmatics of the Orthodox Catholic Church* (Athens, 1959), Vol. I, pp. 21-26, et al.

But apart from this inaccuracy, Professor Metzger's work is a very valuable and sound contribution to the understanding of these Biblical books.

THE REV. DEMETRIOS J. CONSTANTELOS

WOLF WIRGIN and SIEGFRIED MANDEL, *The History of Coins and Symbols in Ancient Israel*. New York: Exposition Press, 1958. (An Exposition-University Book). Pp. 264. 32 plates. \$7.50.

Everybody handles coins; few study them for their own sake. The scientific study of coinage is called numismatics (from the Greek "nomisma," "coin"). Numismatics is often called an ancillary science because many times it can help cast light on other areas of knowledge.

The study of coins is the job of the numismatist, the collecting, buying, and selling of coins is the business of the coin dealer

Wolf Würtin has been collecting Jewish coins in the United States, Europe, and Palestine for over twenty years Siegfried Mandel, the co author, is a professor of English at the Polytechnic Institute of Brooklyn, who has long been interested in symbolism The two have collaborated to produce *The History of Coins and Symbols in Ancient Israel* The result has been rather uneven, but interesting from the point of view of what the authors have to offer in two separate but somewhat related fields, numismatics and symbolism The two topics could well have been presented more fully in two separate books

The numismatic part of the book will no doubt provoke a certain amount of controversy in traditional numismatic circles because it takes issue with the conventional dating and classification of ancient Jewish coins Greco Roman history and numismatics are obviously closely related to any discussion of Jewish numismatics and history of this period and Wolf Würtin minces no words in presenting his interpretation of both in terms of his own coin-collecting experiences He is dissatisfied with the generally accepted patterns and strives to offer what he believes to be the correct approach based upon a fresh interpretation of the numismatic evidence Two principles are clearly stated "First, let us put a *maximum of emphasis on the possible interrelation between the different coin types themselves*. Second, whatever our finds on the relation of coin types may be, they will take priority over any of the old historical writings, regardless of how reliable these writings may seem" (p 21) This obviously reveals the author's greater reliability on the more durable coin sources as historical documents

With these principles as his guiding lights and the coins as concrete examples, the numismatist author offers, among others, the following conclusions (1) shekels originated in the Maccabean era, not during the First Revolt (66-70 A.D.) as has been commonly supposed, (2) the bronze coin is a copy or restoration of the shekel, (3) Antigonus (40-37 B.C.) was the first Jewish king to stamp his royal title on a coin issue, (4) Hyrcan I (135-105 B.C.), who is Jochanan of the Book of Maccabees, was the first Jewish ruler to have his name engraved on coins, (5) a mint existed in Jerusalem before the Maccabean era, (6) the Jewish Alexander coins do not refer to the Jewish king Alexander Jannaeus, but were issued long before and long after him and apparently originated and drew their inspiration from Alexander the Great, (7) the traditional dating of Jewish coins needs to be drastically

revised to conform with the numismatic and historical facts; (8) the controversial "freedom" coins do not indicate an actual political situation but were issued in "*commemoration* of an actual period of fighting rather than during that period itself."

Perhaps the most important contribution of this whole book is the attempt to re-classify the dates on Jewish coins. Wirgin would reconstitute the data to include the following names of ruling high priests and princes of the Hasmonean house, founded by Simon Maccabee: Hyrcan I (135-105 B.C.), Aristobulus (105-104 B.C.), Alexander Jannaeus (104-78 B.C.), Alexandra (78-69 B.C.), Aristobulus II (69-63 B.C.), Hyrcan II (63-40 B.C.), Antigonus (40-37 B.C.). In Appendix I (pp. 254-258), "A New Key to the Dating of Ancient Jewish Coins," is presented a table of new classifications of ancient Jewish coins in ten periods: (1) from an uncertain date till the beginning of the Hasmonean Dynasty, 143/142 B.C.; (2) officiating time of High Priest Simon Maccabaeus, 143/142 till 136/135 B.C.; (3) officiating time of the High Priest Jechochanan Hyrcan I, 135-105 B.C.; (4) reign of the Hasmonean Kings and High Priests, 105-40 B.C.; (5) reign of the Hasmonean King and High Priest Mattathias Antigonus, 40-37 B.C.; (6) reign of King Herod I and his son Archelaus, 37 B.C. till 6 C.E.; (7) Judea under the Roman Procurators appointed by the Emperors Augustus and Tiberius, 6-36 C.E.; (8) reign of King Agrippa I, 37-44 C.E.; (9) the Procurators under Claudius and Nero till the end of the First Revolt, 44-70 C.E., and finally (10) from after the First Revolt till the end of the Second Revolt, 70-135 C.E.

The second principal part of the book (pp. 162-209) is obviously the work of Siegfried Mandel, and is concerned with "Fertility Symbols of Ancient Jewish Coins." Mandel maintains that: "It is true that an object may be nothing more than the object *per se*; but then it must be noted that the object is *not a symbol*, it is a pure and simple sign. A symbol can assume the name *only if it is a partial representation of an object or if it stands for something other than itself.*" (p. 179) With this presupposition in mind, Mandel examines the symbols on Jewish coins and finds them, so we are supposed to believe, fertility symbols and these mainly phallic. At the end of the chapter (p. 209), Mandel concludes: "All peoples have used symbols for religious purposes; the Jews were no exception. As agricultural people too, the Jews lived close to the seasons and the earth, so that both Biblical metaphors and symbols directly point to life-giving forces."

This portion of the book, very Freudian in outlook and interpretation, will undoubtedly provoke severe criticism, and rightly so, because

it places excessive emphasis on would-be primitive origins and not enough on the proper historical and religious significance of the symbolism on Jewish coins. For a man that acknowledges that the Jews have contributed two unique ideas to civilization, namely the Messianic idea and monotheism, Mandel narrowly confines himself to seeing all Jewish symbolism on coins through the eyes of the fertility cult.

The extensive appendices of this book (pp. 213-258, nine in all) include a genealogical table and a map of ancient Palestine, an article on the identification of the Temple Laver, a reprinted article on the authenticity of three shekel hoards from Jerusalem, a short article on the coins found at the time of the Dead Sea Scrolls discovery, an article on a coin of King Agrippa I, notes on fertility symbols, and a new classification key for the dating of ancient Jewish coins. There is also a brief bibliography.

This book has many challenging new ideas to offer, but it should be subjected to the closest scrutiny of numismatists, historians, and scholars before any of the views in it are to obtain wide prominence. Though many will categorically reject the views put forward, the authors have shown their determination to challenge traditional views on their subject, and if nothing else, they are calling the reader's attention to the need for constant re-examination of the historical and numismatic evidence in the light of the latest discoveries and are showing the inadequacies of many of the traditional views. This book deserves attention, if only to answer some of its challenges.

JOHN E. REXINE

ANDRE BONNARD, *Greek Civilization: From the Antigone to Socrates*. Translated by A. Lytton Sells. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1959. Pp. 248 and 32 illustrations.

This is the second volume of Professor Bonnard's work on Greek civilization, beautifully translated again by Professor A. Lytton Sells, and lavishly illustrated with 32 superb illustrations of Greek works of art and landscapes. About the general conception and principles of the book I wrote in this periodical (vol. IV, 1, pp. 78-82) when reviewing the first volume. However, the new material treated in this volume calls for some specific remarks.



Copyright and Use:

As an ATLAS user, you may print, download, or send articles for individual use according to fair use as defined by U.S. and international copyright law and as otherwise authorized under your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement.

No content may be copied or emailed to multiple sites or publicly posted without the copyright holder(s)' express written permission. Any use, decompiling, reproduction, or distribution of this journal in excess of fair use provisions may be a violation of copyright law.

This journal is made available to you through the ATLAS collection with permission from the copyright holder(s). The copyright holder for an entire issue of a journal typically is the journal owner, who also may own the copyright in each article. However, for certain articles, the author of the article may maintain the copyright in the article. Please contact the copyright holder(s) to request permission to use an article or specific work for any use not covered by the fair use provisions of the copyright laws or covered by your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement. For information regarding the copyright holder(s), please refer to the copyright information in the journal, if available, or contact ATLA to request contact information for the copyright holder(s).

About ATLAS:

The ATLA Serials (ATLAS®) collection contains electronic versions of previously published religion and theology journals reproduced with permission. The ATLAS collection is owned and managed by the American Theological Library Association (ATLA) and received initial funding from Lilly Endowment Inc.

The design and final form of this electronic document is the property of the American Theological Library Association.

Dr. Bach approaches his subject in a very personal and intimate tone. In all cases, he has had original contact with all the religions he has described and in describing each of the world's major religions he has included material on the founders, the worship, the sacred scriptures, and the basic beliefs of these religions. In the case of every chapter he draws parallels between the particular religion he happens to be discussing and Christianity.

This book is aimed at the Christian reader. It seeks to emphasize the importance of religion throughout the world and to indicate man's never-ending search for God. But more specifically, by exposing the Christian reader to the major religions of the world, Dr. Bach wants to demonstrate the uniqueness and preciousness of Christianity: "My research has proved that no other religion has as complete a revelation of God as has Christianity. No other faith offers men what we find in Jesus Christ — the Way, the Truth, and the Life." (p. 124) Dr. Bach finds that a survey of world religions should serve to cause the Christian to re-examine his own religious heritage and strengthen his own faith. Each Christian is expected to subject himself to this re-examination, to see what Jesus has meant to him personally. As Dr. Bach says in his concluding remarks to this book: "Let us respect, admire, and appreciate the living religions of the world. Let us also enter sympathetically into the universal quest. But let us never forget that it is only when our own faith has become a vital, a living, a personal experience, only when we are rooted and grounded in the full inspiration and teaching of our church, only when our religion becomes our joy, that we will find the treasure, the pearl of great price, which is in our own back yard. When this happens, our world will be remade, and we can begin, if we wish, to help remake the world." (p. 126)

The book, *Major Religions of the World*, is an excellent handbook for the average Christian reader, simply and clearly but provocatively written.

JOHN E. REXINE

STANLEY I. STUBER, *How We Got Our Denominations: A Primer on Church History*. Revised edition. New York: Association Press, 1959. Pp. 254. \$3.50.

This handy little book is ideal for a bird's eye view of how the various Christian denominations got to be what they are, why they

continue to be as they are, and what their administrative and doctrinal differences or similarities are. Though this book was originally published in 1927, it has undergone complete revision in order to bring it up to date with the rapidly developing and changing picture of Christian Church activity in our own time. This book is a rapid survey of Church history, written by a Protestant in simple but objective fashion.

The book is divided into four distinct portions: I "The Early Church"; II "The Ancient Catholic Church"; III "The Protestant Reformation"; and IV "The Modern Church." Each part is further broken down into chapters and each chapter contains a section, "Helps for Study," at the end. The "Helps for Study" has suggestions for written work, oral discussion, and special assignments. There is also a bibliography for each general part at the end of the book (251-254).

The churches discussed include the Roman Catholic, the Eastern Orthodox, the Protestant Episcopal, the Presbyterian Church, the United Church of Christ, the Lutheran Church, the Reformed Church in America, the Baptist Churches, the Quakers, the Methodist Church, the Universalist Church, the Unitarian Church, the Christian Church (Disciples), and a number of others. Each Church is fairly and objectively but very briefly introduced.

The chapter on the Eastern Orthodox Church may be taken as an example. The author lets the Church speak for itself through its own writings and its own churchmen. Orthodox authorities whom Dr. Stuber quotes or cites include the late Archbishop Chrysostom (of Athens and of all Greece), Professor Stefan Zankow (of the University of Sofia, Bulgaria), Bishop Nicholai of Ochrida, Professor Basil Ioannides (at the Evanston Conference of the World Council of Churches), the late Archbishop Michael, Archbishop Iakovos, and Bishop Athanagoras Kokkinakis, to mention only a few. Dr. Stuber has kept himself well informed indeed.

The final chapter stresses the growing significance of inter-church cooperation: "The denominations are co-operating to a far greater extent than most people realize." (p. 245) It seems fair to say that Dr. Stuber's tested book *How We Got Our Denominations* has itself contributed in its own way to inter-church co-operation and inter-church knowledge.

This reviewer has found Dr. Stuber's book fascinating reading and can see why it has met with such success in classes in universities and colleges, as well as in church schools. Under the guidance of a competent clergyman or teacher, this book can easily provide the core for a very engaging course in the history of the Christian Church.

JOHN E. REXINE



Copyright and Use:

As an ATLAS user, you may print, download, or send articles for individual use according to fair use as defined by U.S. and international copyright law and as otherwise authorized under your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement.

No content may be copied or emailed to multiple sites or publicly posted without the copyright holder(s)' express written permission. Any use, decompiling, reproduction, or distribution of this journal in excess of fair use provisions may be a violation of copyright law.

This journal is made available to you through the ATLAS collection with permission from the copyright holder(s). The copyright holder for an entire issue of a journal typically is the journal owner, who also may own the copyright in each article. However, for certain articles, the author of the article may maintain the copyright in the article. Please contact the copyright holder(s) to request permission to use an article or specific work for any use not covered by the fair use provisions of the copyright laws or covered by your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement. For information regarding the copyright holder(s), please refer to the copyright information in the journal, if available, or contact ATLA to request contact information for the copyright holder(s).

About ATLAS:

The ATLA Serials (ATLAS®) collection contains electronic versions of previously published religion and theology journals reproduced with permission. The ATLAS collection is owned and managed by the American Theological Library Association (ATLA) and received initial funding from Lilly Endowment Inc.

The design and final form of this electronic document is the property of the American Theological Library Association.

IMAGES OF GOD AND ANTI-GOD: STUDIES IN THE METAPHYSICS OF DOSTOYEVSKI

By C. B. ASHANIN

I

In his short but excellent study of Dostoyevski, Nicholas Berdyaev refers to Dostoyevski as one of the greatest metaphysicians of being.¹ This appraisal of the great novelist is even more enhanced by the high place which Berdyaev gives to the metaphysics of being in his own philosophy. Berdyaev claims that Dostoyevski has shown, as no one before him, that ruptures within human existence have a metaphysical character. The religious and philosophical implication of Dostoyevski's insights are significant in that they resolve one of the most difficult problems of theology and philosophy: the relationship between human existence and being, that is, man and the world.² Dostoyevski protests against the doctrine of man which is too empirical and where the deep cleavages within human existence are either ignored or explained away. Dostoyevski points out that a doctrine of man construed upon empirical determinism is bound to be limited in understanding the real problems of human existence and providing right answers by a correct analysis of the human situation. For such a doctrine of man is handicapped by the fact that it associates existence and being, too closely, and interprets the latter ontologically, that is, as final and static. It is obvious that this "monistic patheism," where being dominates existence, imposes impersonalism on human existence and thus makes the overcoming of the cleavage within human existence a meaningless quest. Rather, human existence is left to be overcome by necessity, as a bad fate which is to be suffered and accepted.

Dostoyevski divorces existence from its domination by being and puts existence and being into a dialectical relationship. This, of course, places them in a conflict which requires resolving through an Ultimate

¹ Nicholas Berdyaev, *Dostoyevski* (New York: Meridian Books, 1957).

² By "Being" in this article is meant that reality which stands over against man and which he calls the "IT." The term "Existence" denotes that reality which is given to man from within and which he calls interchangeably the "I" or the "THOU."

Reality which transcends and creates both of them. Naturally, the question arises, whether there is such a Reality. Dostoyevski says that there is, and my endeavor here shall be to show how he discovers it.

According to Dostoyevski, man encounters this Ultimate Reality in and through freedom, which man experiences first and foremost within human existence. The freedom within existence clearly denies the supremacy of necessity as being final. And this, of course, means a denial of the supremacy of being over existence.

Freedom, which renounces the primacy of being over existence, discloses that the very fact that being claims finality and appears as an ontic-reality is because it suffers from the same cleavage to which existence is exposed. Existence and being are interrelated, but as their relationship is characterized by the revolt of freedom within existence, against the supremacy of being, this raises a metaphysical problem about their nature. Here freedom discloses, by the fact of its deep involvement in existence and being, that it shares with them a common source. The transcendental aspect of its nature indicates that the source of freedom stands over against being and existence as the Ultimate Reality, for in them freedom creates revolt and thus exposes their estrangement from the Ultimate Reality — their ontological ground, whenever they claim finality for themselves.

The functional nature of freedom shows that it is not "the Being itself," to use a Kantian term, and that it does not in itself have finality. Rather, freedom points to its source as being Ultimate, for freedom strives to reveal its source as the goal and meaning of all things by reconciling all things to its own and their Source. Freedom indicates that the Ultimate Being, God, is an absolutely free, unified and self-related reality. As such, He possesses absolute power by which He creates the being outside Himself and reveals His image in it. This means that He gives to His creation a "Communal Nature" because He is related to it in Love, that is, His creation is His own personal concern. Love is the inner drive of God towards creating being and infusing it with freedom. The presence of freedom in creation is the divine Providence upholding and guiding it. When created Being, according to Dostoyevski, usurps the freedom which it, as God's creation, possesses, in order to establish itself as an independent and final reality in opposition to God, its ontological source, this brings the estrangement of being and creates a cleavage within it, for freedom and necessity, the estranged principle, are struggling with each other. Both existence and being reveal this cleavage, experienced as the predicament of man and the world. But this predicament is neither final

nor natural. The intensity of the conflict is a tragedy which seeks redemption, that is, the healing of the estrangement between Creator and creature, and the final triumph of freedom over necessity in man and the world.

From this short exposition of Dostoyevski's analysis it is evident that Dostoyevski has made a new and original approach to the problem of estrangement in existence and being and Berdyaev is right in considering Dostoyevski a landmark in the development of the human spirit, and dividing the philosophy of religion into pre- and post-Dostoyevski periods.

II

What has been said so far demands further elucidation, for the crucial question lies in the answer to the problem, where does Dostoyevski get his concept of absolute freedom, for it would be insufficient proof to deduce it from existence alone, although it cannot be denied that existence itself presents the problem of freedom. Dostoyevski says that the problem of Absolute Freedom is revealed within human existence in the person of Christ. Christ, the God-Man, makes the problem of absolute freedom a human problem. But what Christ reveals about freedom is of the divine transcendental origin, in the sense that it cannot be accounted for except as the revelation of the Ultimate Being succouring its creature, the finite being, in its estrangement from God, by taking the human predicament upon himself.³ In Christ creaturely freedom meets Absolute freedom. In the absolute freedom of God, revealed in Christ, creaturely freedom recognizes its transcendental source and its true nature. This creates in human existence a longing to overcome its "fallen state," the cleavage and ruptures within existence. Further, human existence recognizes that freedom is bound

³ This problem Dostoyevski has argued forcefully in his most original Christology, in the legend of the Grand Inquisitor in *Brothers Karamazov*, where Dostoyevski expounds the Gospel narrative of temptation (*Mk.* I, 12 ff.; *Mt.* IV, 1-11; *Lu.* IV, 1-13) on the basis of the analysis of the questions put to the tempted Christ and concludes in the words of the Grand Inquisitor:

"If it were possible to imagine, simply for the sake of argument, that those three questions of the dread Spirit had perished utterly from the books, and that we had to restore them and to invent them anew . . . and gathered together all the wise men of the earth — rulers, chief priests, learned men, philosophers, poets — and had set them the task to invent three questions such as would . . . express in three human phrases the whole future history of the world and humanity — dost thou believe that all the wisdom of the earth united could have invented . . . equal to the three questions put to thee [Christ — insertion mine] . . . in the wilderness? From the miracle of their statements . . . we can see that we have here to do with the *absolute* and the *eternal*." (italics mine)

up with personality. This makes human existence conscious that the world as an impersonal ontological reality is an illusion. It is such for in it freedom is denied and reduced to the minimum. In its place its opposite, necessity, is dominant. This deprives the world of being Cosmos (the beautiful creation of God). Thus the imperative of creative freedom in human existence is not only to overcome its own threat by renouncing the primacy of being over existence, but also to restore to the universe its character of "cosmos."⁴ In this, for Dostoyevski, lies the human and cosmic significance of Christ as the redeemer. Dostoyevski strives to make the significance of Christ apparent not only for theology, but for philosophy as well. In this he has partly succeeded, for the philosophical quest in Russian thought after Dostoyevski has become a religious quest and the Russian religious philosophy deeply Christocentric, as exemplified by Solovyov, Berdyaev, Frank, N. Lossky, to mention only a few.

III

The estranged freedom does not have an ontological basis, nor of course, could it have one, but it does have a metaphysical character. The cosmic nature of the estrangement is a form of Demonic Structure. This demonic structure manifests its image in the form of Anti-God through the estranged freedom in existence and being. For Dostoyevski the empirical world is a realm dominated by the images of God (Christ) and Anti-God (the Anti-Christ). Since these images are by nature opposed, they involve the whole created being in the Universal and Spiritual conflict. What makes the recognition of these two images confusing, in spite of the fact that the nature of each is different (for they are based on two types of freedom which inspire them, the real and the estranged), is that they both appear in a "trinitarian" form. The similarity of form is not to be underestimated as being unimportant, for the form plays a very important role in man's recognition of the world and of himself and God. And it is a great spiritual achievement of Dostoyevski to have drawn attention to the "trinitarian" forms of both the divine and demonic images. By having done this he has

⁴ This spiritual concern of the redeemed man is explicitly stated in the conversations and exhortations of Father Zossima in *Brothers Karamazov* . . . "When you are left alone fall on the earth and kiss it, water it with your tears and it will bring forth fruit even though no one has seen you in your solitude. . . . When you are left alone pray. Love to throw yourself on the earth and kiss it. Kiss the earth and love it with an unceasing, consuming love. Love all men, love everything. . . ."

made it possible for man's spirituality to liberate itself from the bondage to form as such, by pointing to its ambiguities. This, of course, is a step towards the transcendence of form, and a search for the essences behind the form and an ecstatic encounter of the human spirit with their nature. Since these are free from ambiguities of form and are distinct from one another, this enables man to know the Ultimate Reality and also to grasp the nature of the demonic structure. At this point the human personality is free to make its decision for God and thus contribute towards bringing the Cosmic Conflict nearer to its final stage. Here human personality achieves its transcendence and the importance of St. Augustine's dictum *transcende te ipsum*, acquires full meaning as a grasp of one's selfhood as having a universal significance and destiny.

As regards the "trinitarian" forms of the Divine and Demonic images, their similarity appears somewhat strange. The "trinitarian" form of the Divine does not present great difficulty in grasping its why. For, since God is informed with creative freedom, his nature seeks the other, not to oppose him, but to affirm his being. God does this by outgoing from Himself and giving Himself to the other, so that the other may exist and share in being. Thus God creates the community of being. The community of being is essential to Divine creative freedom which is also Divine Love, and Love needs communion — sharing. The "trinitarian" form of the demonic is somewhat puzzling at first. But it soon becomes clear when we grasp that the demonic structure (Gestalt) seeks to have ontological character and be God. This, of course, involves the demonic in opposition to God and in revolt against Him. To "dethrone" God and impose itself as final and absolute, the demonic must aim at the destruction of the Community of Being revealed in God. To this must be further added that the "Communal Nature" of God is the source of personal life and personal principle in being. The demonic opposes communal and personal nature in being, whose source is God, by the collectivistic and impersonal principle. This collectivism appears in a "trinitarian" form in the demonic structure but the difference between it and the "trinitarian" form of the divine is that the demonic does not express the triune principle of being, as is the case with the divine trinitarian form, where the form and the reality which it reveals are identical. In essence, "the trinitarian form" of the demonic is nothing but a generalization of "the individualistic principle in revolt," upon which the

demonic is based.⁵ The "individualistic principle in revolt," disguised in a collective form, creates the impression of being universal and ultimate and thus capable of overcoming the communal nature of personal being and its living pluralism and turning it into the general static impersonal "oneness" of what it ultimately the non-being, where life and spirit have become extinct.

Thus the trinitarian forms of the divine and demonic are the problems, not of abstract thought, but of personal life itself, in the sense that the analysis of the trinitarian form of the divine emphasizes that God creates and upholds it, while the analysis of the trinitarian form of the demonic shows that it destroys personal life.⁶

IV

According to Dostoyevski, the images of God and Anti-God dominate man and his world. They are revealed to man directly in his own and his fellow men's personalities. Dostoyevski focuses all the creative powers of his genius to illustrate this and to show that man is not an independent being, but a creature in which the two realms, the divine and the demonic, meet, each one claiming man for itself. Since all this is of the highest importance for man's destiny, Dostoyevski takes it upon himself as his urgent task to reveal the real natures of God and Anti-God, so that man may know them and discern which of the two has the real being, so that he may choose it for himself also.

In Dostoyevski, the man who bears the Image of God is essentially the man of "sobornost," the *universal man*.⁷ He embraces in Love not only his fellowmen, but the whole of creation. Father Zossima and Alyosha in *Brothers Karamazov* are such people. They are such because they are the creation of God in whom the Father and the Son renounce Themselves in love for each other, not seeking their own selfhoods, but that of the other. Neither of them say "I am," but "Thou art." This fullness of love in the Divine Life reveals within itself the Beauty and Harmony in which the Love of the Father and of the Son displays

⁵ By "individualistic principle in revolt" I mean the refusal of created being to accept its creatureliness *alongside* of others. Rather, it dissociates itself from the rest being and sees in this act a liberation of itself and proclaims this separation as the absolute freedom, claiming to be its creator and thus the Ultimate Reality.

⁶ This discussion about "trinitarian forms" of the divine and the demonic is suggestive in understanding real issues behind the apparent similarity between the neo-Platonist (Plotinus and Hegel) and Christian doctrines of God.

⁷ V. Ivanov, *Freedom and the Tragic Life* (London, 1952).

the indestructibility and the perfection of the power of being in God. This is the revelation of the Father and the Son in the Holy Spirit, and the Holy Spirit in Them in whom the Father's and the Son's "Thou art" to each other reveals the Divine "We are."⁸ This conception of God as the bearer of the personal principle, the principle of community of being, which is supported and upheld by mutual love and self-sacrifice for the other, lies behind the words of Prince Mishkin in Dostoyevski's *Idiot*, "Beauty will save the world." The world will be saved by the divine love in which the harmony and the beauty of the Being of God is revealed, whose power will save the world from ugliness, which is destruction. Beauty creates form and endows it with the power of being, while ugliness destroys, revealing the non-being.

The man in Dostoyevski who bears the image of the Anti-God and is the complete antithesis to the universal man, lives in constant protest against God and human existence. He constantly says "no" to God and to life. Such people are Ivan Karamazov, who says that he returns the ticket for entrance into life to God, and Kirilov, who commits suicide. There are hosts of others, especially in Dostoyevski's novel, *The Possessed*, in which the image of the Anti-God expresses itself in subtle but effective destruction of existence and turns it into non-being.⁹

The Anti-God, whose children these heroes from the underworld are, has non original being in himself, for he is a creature. He constantly fights against God, denies Him, and yet the act of destruction itself reveals the Anti-God displaying the three-foldness of his being (imitating God who in the act of Creation reveals His own three-ness of person). The "demonic trinity" cannot be called triune, because the Anti-God is an uneasy triumvirate, where the associates hate each other and work for the undoing of what the other is building, thus accomplishing the destruction of the first "person" in the Anti-God who (unlike the First Person in the Holy Trinity) says "I am." Dostoyevski calls him "Lucifer." All those that bear the image of the Anti-God say the same "I am" to themselves, echoing Lucifer's message to them: "You shall be Gods." "Thou art who can say, like God, 'I am.'

⁸ This "We are," while re-affirming the Father's and the Son's "Thou art" to each other, brings into mutual "Thou art's" the "I am because Thou art" also, which would not be there if the Holy Spirit were not immanent in the Divine Life alongside the Father and the Son to reveal it.

⁹ Non-being means the illusion of being, where form has lost the power of being and itself is in a state of deformation.

Therefore thou art entitled to rule over the universe, to have it in thy power.”¹⁰

When Lucifer had inspired man to claim Godhead for himself and as soon as “I am” man reflects upon his demonic “I am,” Ahriman, the second “person,” or rather, modus, of this demonic “trinity” comes and says to man (unlike the Son of God, the second person of the Holy Trinity), “You know you are *not*; give it up; commit suicide; you only pretend.”

The third modus of the Anti-God is the female figure, the Beauty of Sodom, by which Dostoyevski means the ugliness of non-being—the demonic “we are not.”

“When in *Crime and Punishment* Raskolnikov and Svedrigailov try to gaze into each other’s nature and the former, full of loathing at the bottom of his soul — has to agree with his counterpart when the latter declares that the fatal bond between them is not fortuitous, that they have an essential affinity and resemble enemy twins — then it is Lucifer that dwells in one and Ahriman who holds the other prisoner, and it is those two powers that survey each other within the other, the yawning black depths that are in both. For Dostoyevski the two demons are two manifestations of one substance; which is not, however, of necessity completely represented in this duality, but on the contrary contains in its Satanic depths a third and female figure, the Beauty of Sodom, which Dostoyevski, that explorer of Hell, contrasts with the beauty of Our Lady.”¹¹

V

The “trinitarian” image of Anti-God is a description of the dialectical activity of what I have called in this article “the individualistic principle in revolt” which divides and destroys being. I have already pointed out that Dostoyevski attributes this cleavage within being to Freedom, which is estranged from its ontological source.

By way of estranged freedom man comes to know that inner division of self which is evil and demonic, for the separate parts of being become personified apart and engaged in each other’s destruction. This is demonic possession — the presence of the demonic image in man and the world, the utter evil, the Devil. In *Brothers Karamazov* Dosto-

¹⁰ Ivanov, *op. cit.*, p. 127.

¹¹ Ivanov, *ibid.*, p. 121.

yevski describes how Ivan Karamazov has fallen into this state of demonic division of being. He tells Satan: "You are an incarnation of myself, but only one side of me—of my thoughts and feelings, and only of the nastiest and stupidest of them . . . you are myself, but with a different face . . . you are not somebody else. You are I, and nothing more, you are my fancy." In this cleavage we see the ugliness of non-being destroying being. Dostoyevski called it Sodom.¹²

How then, can man be saved from the attack of the demonic image? Through choice, personal choice for being. Dostoyevski gives all-important significance to this choice. And this explains why he contrasts the ugliness of Sodom, the final destruction of being, which is the metaphysical implication of the estranged freedom with the beauty of Our Lady, for in her wholehearted choice of God's will . . . "Let it be to me according to Your word" . . . lies the way towards God—towards unity with the community of being, where creative freedom unites all things.

The description of God as the "Community of Being" revealed in a trinitarian form provides an understanding of the problem of the demonic, threatening human existence in the form of an extreme individualism, or its counterpart, collectivism. I hope that from this study also the relevance of the Christian doctrine of God as the Trinity, i.e., the Community of Being, emerges as the only meaningful doctrine which could show the way of overcoming the demonic in human existence. The Christian doctrine of God declares that in the heart of God there lies a communion of love, through which God's Being affirms itself and everything which exists. In this doctrine lies the message of Christianity, that the fulfillment of human existence lies in the community, whereby every individual lives for the others and the others for him. In this lies the overcoming of individualism and of collectivism, which by nature are anti-God. They are both frightening because they reveal the image of Anti-God by splitting the two sides of the

¹² "All Dostoyevski's 'divided' people have a devil, though less clearly visible than Ivan's is to him. This second self is the spirit of not-being. It represents the loss of the essence of personality and is the manifestation of an empty liberty, the freedom of nothingness. The ideal of Sodom is only a ghost of life, and Sverdrikov definitely given up to that ideal, himself becomes nothing more than a phantom with no vestige of personality left. Nothingness is immanent in evil. The divided man can find salvation nowhere but in the second, final freedom, freedom in the grace and truth of Christ. To mend that inner cleavage and banish that nightmare of Satan, a man must make a definitive choice and choose Being itself." N. Berdyaev, *op. cit.*, p. 110.

Divine Nature, His Unity and His Diversity, and by opposing the one against the other, while in the two together lies the unbreakable structure of the personality of God.

Paul Florensky, a Russian theologian, once wrote that "the dogma of trinity becomes the common ground of religion and philosophy and in this dogma the perennial conflict between them is overcome."¹³ Dostoyevski has shown that the problem of the metaphysics of being needs the help of both philosophy and theology and that in this problem lies their contact and possible reconciliation. The relevance of both theology and philosophy for human existence would be much enhanced if they were more deeply concerned with the analysis of the human situation in its metaphysical aspect. Dostoyevski has made a plea for this and in this study I have tried to draw attention to his plea.

DEPT. OF DIVINITY

UNIVERSITY COLLEGE OF GHANA

¹³ Paul Florensky, *Vstupitelnoe Slovo* (Sergiev Posad, 1914).



Copyright and Use:

As an ATLAS user, you may print, download, or send articles for individual use according to fair use as defined by U.S. and international copyright law and as otherwise authorized under your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement.

No content may be copied or emailed to multiple sites or publicly posted without the copyright holder(s)' express written permission. Any use, decompiling, reproduction, or distribution of this journal in excess of fair use provisions may be a violation of copyright law.

This journal is made available to you through the ATLAS collection with permission from the copyright holder(s). The copyright holder for an entire issue of a journal typically is the journal owner, who also may own the copyright in each article. However, for certain articles, the author of the article may maintain the copyright in the article. Please contact the copyright holder(s) to request permission to use an article or specific work for any use not covered by the fair use provisions of the copyright laws or covered by your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement. For information regarding the copyright holder(s), please refer to the copyright information in the journal, if available, or contact ATLA to request contact information for the copyright holder(s).

About ATLAS:

The ATLA Serials (ATLAS®) collection contains electronic versions of previously published religion and theology journals reproduced with permission. The ATLAS collection is owned and managed by the American Theological Library Association (ATLA) and received initial funding from Lilly Endowment Inc.

The design and final form of this electronic document is the property of the American Theological Library Association.

and the Orient in general, which exercised a decisive influence on the transformation of Roman paganism. Yet, all these native and foreign cults and beliefs contributed greatly "to the religious chaos in which the ancient world was struggling before the reign of Constantine" (p. 197).

Cumont reminds us once again that "when the atrophied parts of the Roman religion had been removed foreign elements had combined to give it a new vigor" (p. 202). But this syncretism could not survive as a religion for there was no continuity of tradition and of theological thought and moral principles. It did however prepare "all nations to unite in the bosom of a universal church" (p. 211). Such is the conclusion of this massive and scholarly work.

For the student of the Christian religion, this book is an excellent introduction to the religious climate and atmosphere in which Christianity was born. For the student of Roman history or Graeco-Roman civilization, it is a sure guide to the understanding of moral and religious conditions in the Eastern Mediterranean. Indeed a profound and provocative work.

THE REV. DEMETRIOS J. CONSTANTELOS

BRUCE M. METZGER, *An Introduction to the Apocrypha*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1957. Pp. xii, 274.

For the Greek Orthodox reader the title of this book is misleading. It is not an introduction to the apocrypha and pseudepigrapha according to the Greek Orthodox terminology, but to the books of the Old Testament known in the Church as Deuterocanonical or Ἀναγνωστικά. As such the present volume is of great importance to the Orthodox Christian. This literature is of great historical value, not to mention the ethical and educational, for it throws much light on the period beginning around 400 B.C. down to the birth of Christianity.

Professor Metzger, a distinguished Biblical and historical scholar at Princeton Theological Seminary, presents a very comprehensive and scholarly analysis of the books that comprise this Biblical literature. This work was based on the text included in the Revised Standard edition of the Bible published in 1957.

The author follows the Protestant tradition and does not regard these books as part of the Bible. He admits, however, that they embody religious and moral insights of permanent value. He points out that this literature supplies "important information regarding the life and thought of the Jewish people during a significant period of their history, namely the period just prior to the emergence of Christianity." Thus he urges their study as excellent means for the understanding of the political, cultural, ethical and religious atmosphere of the times contemporary to Christ.

In non-technical language, Professor Metzger treats many significant phases of this fundamental literature. In his introductory chapter he defines the literature and places it in its historical place. This is followed by a description and analysis of each one of the books with reference to their composition, content, data and language.

In this discussion of the relationship between these books and the New Testament, Professor Metzger probes the meaning of the New Testament parallels and allusions to this literature. He observes that "it is not too much to regard these intertestamental books as an historical hyphen that serves a useful function in bridging what to most readers of the Bible is a blank of several hundred years" (p. 152). Furthermore, he presents evidence that the New Testament authors were well acquainted with these books, and writers such as Paul, James, and the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews were influenced directly or indirectly by them. He draws a number of parallel verses from the New Testament and this literature.

The author proceeds then to a survey of the status of this literature in the Church, early and contemporary. In his discussion of this topic he deals with the status of this literature in the Orthodox Church today. Here I wish to take exception with the author who states that "there appears to be no unanimity on the subject of the canon in the Greek Orthodox Church today . . . and the Greek clergy may hold and teach what they please about it" (p. 195).

The truth is that the position of the Greek Orthodox Church is unequivocal. The fact that the Eastern Church has been using the longer list of the canon which always included this literature; the place of these books in the prayer and Liturgical life of the church today; their historical and chronological position between the accepted Old Testament times (before 400 B.C.) and the New Testament epoch; their influence upon New Testament thought; their systematic use by the early Fathers and teachers of the Christian Church down to the fourth

century; the confirmation by the Seventh Ecumenical Council of previous councils which dealt with the canon of the Holy Scriptures, such as Laodicia and Trullo, indicate that the Church stands unanimous in favor of the canonicity of these books.

The fact that there was a tendency among certain Fathers to use the Hebrew canon instead of the Septuagint does not overthrow the prevalent position of the Church. The conscience of the Church has accepted them as canonical. It is true however, that from the theoretical point of view, *de iure* the position of the Church is not crystal clear; there is no specific canon by an Ecumenical Council which speaks about the canonicity of these books. But *de facto* there is no doubt about their canonical status in the Church. As such it may be the task of the Church to make them formally canonical in the forthcoming Pan-Orthodox Synod.

Contemporary Greek Orthodox scholars are specific about this subject. Practically all of them accept their canonicity. See for example: P. I. Bratsiotis, *Introduction to the Old Testament* (Athens, 1937), pp. 518-519; Christos Androutsos, *Dogmatics of Orthodox Eastern Church* (2nd Ed. Athens, 1956), pp. 3-5; P. I. Bratsiotis, *An Epitome Introduction to the Old Testament* (Athens, 1955), pp. 253-256; Vasilios Vellas, *The Holy Scripture in the Greek Orthodox Church* (Athens, 1958), pp. 5-6; Ioannis Karmires, *Synopsis of the Dogmatical Teaching of the Orthodox Catholic Church* (Athens, 1957), pp. 10-11; P. N. Trembelas, *Dogmatics of the Orthodox Catholic Church* (Athens, 1959), Vol. I, pp. 21-26, et al.

But apart from this inaccuracy, Professor Metzger's work is a very valuable and sound contribution to the understanding of these Biblical books.

THE REV. DEMETRIOS J. CONSTANTELOS

WOLF WIRGIN and SIEGFRIED MANDEL, *The History of Coins and Symbols in Ancient Israel*. New York: Exposition Press, 1958. (An Exposition-University Book). Pp. 264. 32 plates. \$7.50.

Everybody handles coins; few study them for their own sake. The scientific study of coinage is called numismatics (from the Greek "nomisma," "coin"). Numismatics is often called an ancillary science because many times it can help cast light on other areas of knowledge.



Copyright and Use:

As an ATLAS user, you may print, download, or send articles for individual use according to fair use as defined by U.S. and international copyright law and as otherwise authorized under your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement.

No content may be copied or emailed to multiple sites or publicly posted without the copyright holder(s)' express written permission. Any use, decompiling, reproduction, or distribution of this journal in excess of fair use provisions may be a violation of copyright law.

This journal is made available to you through the ATLAS collection with permission from the copyright holder(s). The copyright holder for an entire issue of a journal typically is the journal owner, who also may own the copyright in each article. However, for certain articles, the author of the article may maintain the copyright in the article. Please contact the copyright holder(s) to request permission to use an article or specific work for any use not covered by the fair use provisions of the copyright laws or covered by your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement. For information regarding the copyright holder(s), please refer to the copyright information in the journal, if available, or contact ATLA to request contact information for the copyright holder(s).

About ATLAS:

The ATLA Serials (ATLAS®) collection contains electronic versions of previously published religion and theology journals reproduced with permission. The ATLAS collection is owned and managed by the American Theological Library Association (ATLA) and received initial funding from Lilly Endowment Inc.

The design and final form of this electronic document is the property of the American Theological Library Association.

THE ECUMENICAL PATRIARCHATE UNDER THE TURKISH REPUBLIC: THE FIRST TEN YEARS

By HARRY J. PSOMIADES*

The theme of this paper is the struggle of the Ecumenical Patriarchate for survival in Kemalist Turkey and the role of the Ecumenical Patriarchate in Graeco-Turkish diplomacy. The first ten years of the Patriarchate under the Turkish Republic were difficult ones for Orthodoxy, and seriously threatened to disrupt the prospects of peace in the Balkans and the Near East. The need for adjustment and compromise forced upon the Ecumenical Patriarchate by the triumph of nationalism in the Balkans and the Near East, and by the tragic expulsion of Hellenism from Anatolia, marks the beginning of a major turning point in the history of the Church of Constantinople.

THE LAUSANNE SETTLEMENT

On December 16, 1922, the Turkish delegation presented to the sub-commission on the exchange of populations a written declaration supporting its previous requests for the removal of the Ecumenical Patriarchate from Turkey on the grounds that a radical modification had taken place in the organization of the new Turkish state. The declaration maintained that 'the Government of the Grand National Assembly intended to grant to minorities resident in Turkey rights identical with those which had been granted to minorities in the States enlarged or newly constituted as a result of the great war.' It added that the Turkish Government,

' . . . by separating the Caliphate and the State, and by establishing a democratic régime, had suppressed the privileges which had been granted in the Ottoman Empire to the non-Muslim communities. The relation between the char-

* Mr. Psomiades is a lecturer in Government, Columbia University. The research in which this article is based was made possible by funds granted by the Ford Foundation. The Foundation, however, is not to be understood as approving by virtue of its grant any of the statements or views expressed therein.

itable, educational and philanthropic institutions of the minorities and the State must henceforth be carried on direct; the clergy and its hierachal chief must not in the future concern itself with any but spiritual matters. The Patriarchate, which had always been a political organ, must be transferred to some place outside the frontier of Turkey, seeing that as a result of the abolition of the political privileges which it had formerly enjoyed and of the organic institutions which depended on it, it had lost all reason to exist.¹

On January 4, 1923, the Turkish delegation formally demanded that the Ecumenical Patriarchate be removed from Turkey. It drew attention to the very hostile attitude adopted by the Patriarchate towards Turkey in the course of the last war, and reasoned that the abolition of the temporal power of the Caliph called for the removal of the Patriarchate from Constantinople. It threatened to remove all the Greeks from Constantinople and to withdraw its acceptance in principle of the solution proposed for all the other questions submitted to the sub-commission, if the question of the Patriarchate were not solved to its satisfaction. It suggested that the Patriarchate could transfer its seat to Mount Athos and exercise thence its spiritual influence over the Orthodox world.²

In return for the expulsion of the Patriarchate from Turkey, it appeared that the Turkish Government was prepared to make certain concessions to the Greeks. In effect, its delegation gave the President of the sub-commission on the exchange of populations, G. C. Montagna, to understand that if the Greeks accepted the Turkish demand, it was prepared to extend the scope of some of the clauses for the retention of a greater number of Greeks in Constantinople.³

The Turkish request, however, was unanimously opposed in the sub-commission. The French delegation, in an attempt to

¹ Great Britain, *Parliamentary Papers*, "Lausanne Conference on Near Eastern Affairs, 1922-1923," "Records of Proceedings and Draft Terms of Peace, Turkey No. 1 (1923)," Cmd 1814. p. 333. Hereafter cited as *LCNEA*.

² *Ibid.*, pp. 336-337. While the Turkish Government was calling for the removal of the Ecumenical Patriarchate from Turkey at Lausanne, at home it sought to undermine that institution by supporting for a while the Turkish Orthodox Church plan of Papa Efthim Karahissaridis, *infra*, p. 8.

³ *Ibid.*, pp. 316-317, 332.

facilitate an accord, proposed a compromise formula whereby the Ecumenical Patriarchate would remain in Constantinople on condition that it give up all its political power. The Greek delegation, from the beginning, accepted and supported the idea that the Patriarchate should be divested of the political power bestowed upon it by the defunct Ottoman state. The Turkish delegation rejected the proposal, and the matter was referred to the First Commission of the Conference.⁴

The Territorial and Military Commission met on January 10, 1923, to hear the report of Montagna. Lord Curzon, President of the Commission, took the initiative in formulating a final solution of the problem. With the unanimous support of the inviting powers and of the Orthodox Christian states, he met the Turkish demand with equal firmness. 'There seems to me to be no reason why the Patriarch should not continue to exercise his spiritual and ecclesiastical prerogatives without enjoying any sort of political and administrative authority at all. On the other hand, if these spiritual and ecclesiastical prerogatives were to be destroyed and the seat of the Patriarchate removed from Constantinople, a shock would be delivered to the conscience of the whole civilized world.'⁵ Venizelos urged the Turks to accept Lord Curzon's proposals and stated that if they were accepted, the Greek delegation would 'take steps with a view to the retirement of the Patriarch now in power.'⁶

In the face of this opposition and the proposal of Venizelos, Ismet Pasha, the chief Turkish delegate, gave a reluctant verbal promise that his Government would retain the Ecumenical Patriarchate, provided that it would confine itself within the limits of purely religious matters. The Turkish delegation, he said, 'taking note of the solemn declarations and assurances which have just been given concerning the future situation and attitude of the Patriarchate, and in order to give a supreme proof of its conciliatory dispositions, renounces the expulsion of the Patriarchate from Constantinople.'⁷ Thus, the problem of the Ecumenical

⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 332-333.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 319.

⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 324-325; Harold Nicolson, *Curzon: The Last Phase, 1919-1925* (Boston, 1934), p. 320.

⁷ Ministère des Affaires Etrangères, *Documents diplomatiques*, "Conférence de Lausanne," I (Paris, 1923), p. 268.

Patriarchate, which had not only considerably retarded the work of the Conference, but also threatened, for a while, to provoke a complete rupture of the negotiations, was resolved.

Why was it that the Turkish Government was so adamant on this issue? It appears that from the beginning it sought the expulsion of the Patriarchate as a concession for the retention of the Greek minority in Constantinople. Originally, it demanded that both the Patriarchate and the Greek minority leave Turkey so as to bring to an end Greek aspirations for the imperial capital of Byzantium. Such a course, it felt, would constitute for Greece a definite abandonment of the Μεγάλη Ἰδέα. Secondly, the anti-Turkish activity of Meletios IV, who had been Ecumenical Patriarch since December, 1921, was extremely distasteful to the Turkish Government; and it was only after the promise of Venizelos that Meletios IV would be replaced, that İsmet Pasha finally agreed to allow the Patriarchate to remain. Thirdly, it seemed that the Ankara Government may have felt that by expelling the Patriarchate, the most important religious institution in the Ottoman Empire after the Caliphate, the success of its plan to abolish the Caliphate and to expel all the members of the Ottoman imperial family from Turkey would be enhanced. It wanted to prove to its Muslim population that the expulsion of all religious authorities was a general measure and not anti-Muslim, that it was a consequence of the adoption of the fundamental principles of Western democracy.⁸ Fourthly, its actions were undoubtedly colored by the *Millet* mentality. That the Patriarchate and the Greek Christian minority of Turkey are generally considered as untrustworthy aliens in the Turkish body-politic is a result, in part, of the confusion in the Turkish Muslim mind between what is essentially national with what is essentially religious. For all practical purposes religion is still the dividing line in Turkish society, and a man's creed is the determinant of his political and

⁸ Mustafa Kemal (Atatürk), *A Speech Delivered by Ghazi Mustapha Kemal . . . October 1927* (Leipzig, 1929), pp. 572, 583-585, 588-589, 598, 681. Hereafter cited as *The Speech*.

Roderic H. Davison, "Turkish Diplomacy from Mudros to Lausanne," G. A. Craig and F. Gilbert, edd., *The Diplomats 1919-1939* (Princeton, 1953), p. 199.

social status.⁹ And finally, the Turks had recently fought the Greeks in a bitter military campaign upon which their existence as a nation depended. Turkish public opinion demanded that Greece pay dearly for its Anatolian venture.

Although in the final Treaty and the Conventions annexed, there were no clauses providing for the rights and privileges of the Ecumenical Patriarchate, İsmet Pasha's declarations regarding the irremovability of the Patriarchate are clearly in the nature of an international engagement.¹⁰ While the Treaty of Lausanne assured the Ecumenical Patriarchate a seat in Constantinople, it did not, in effect, prevent the Turkish Government from interfering with the liberty of the Patriarch and the free exercise of his ecumenical function. In fact, the future of the

⁹ Alexandre Devedji, *L'Echange obligatoire des minorités grecques et turques* (Paris, 1929), p. 68.

Orhan Münir, *Minderheiten im osmanischen Reich und in der neuen Türkei* (Köln, 1937), p. 147ff.

Harry K. Psomiades, "Turkey: Progress and Problems," *Middle Eastern Affairs*, Vol. VIII, No. 3 (March, 1957), pp. 93-95.

¹⁰ It can be argued that İsmet Pasha's declaration regarding the Patriarchate was an oral agreement and as such binding under international law. Although both Brierly and the Harvard Research group exclude oral agreements from their definitions of 'treaty,' neither denies the possibility that oral agreements may be binding under international law. Cf. the opinion of the Permanent Court of International Justice in the Eastern Greenland Case, P.C.I.J., Ser. A/B, No. 52 (1933), p. 71. In this case the Court upheld that oral agreements between states have the effect of treaties. See also Herbert W. Briggs, *The Law of Nations*, (New York, 1952), p. 838. For oral agreements as treaties in British practice see Arnold D. McNair, *The Law of Treaties: British Practice and Opinion* (New York, 1938), pp. 47-50.

It is argued that the international position of the Patriarchate is supported by the Treaty of Paris, March 1856, Article IX and the Treaty of Berlin, July 1878, Article LXII, which, it is claimed, retain their full value, even after the signature of the Treaty of Lausanne. Because the Lausanne Treaty made no mention of the Patriarchate, it is maintained that the pre-existing situation is not in any way influenced by that settlement. It is also argued that Articles 40 and 41 of the Lausanne Treaty provide for the non-Muslim minorities the right to establish their own religious, social, and educational institutions. The fate of the Ecumenical Patriarch, who is also Archbishop of Constantinople, is directly connected with that of the Greek minority in Turkey. Cf. Basil S. Giannakakis, "International Status of the Ecumenical Patriarchate," *The Greek Orthodox Theological Review* (Brookline, Massachusetts) Vol. II, No. 2 (December, 1956), pp. 10-26 and Vol. III, No. 1 (Summer, 1957), pp. 26-46.

Patriarchate was to depend, as it had since Greek Independence, upon the temper of Graeco-Turkish relations.

PAPA EFTHIM AND THE TURKISH ORTHODOX CHURCH

The anti-Turkish statements and activities of the reigning Patriarch, Meletios IV, considerably weakened the status of the Ecumenical Patriarchate in Constantinople.¹¹ While the Turkish Government was moving for the dismissal of the Patriarchate from Turkey at Lausanne, it was also seeking to undermine the Patriarchate by supporting, for a while, factions within the church and Papa Efthim Karahissaridis' Turkish Orthodox Church project.¹²

Papa Efthim, with the apparent support and approval of the Turkish Government, attempted to organize a Turkish Orthodox Church antagonistic to and independent of the Ecumenical Patriarchate. In the Autumn of 1922, Prokopios, Metropolitan of Iconium (Konya) and the highest ranking prelate left in Anatolia, formed a 'Synod' with two subordinate titular bishops and took other action at variance with Orthodox Christian canon law. They coöpted two other priests, one of whom was Papa Efthim, and this body of five prelates claimed to be the governing body of the 'Turkish Orthodox Church.' Papa Efthim was chosen as the 'General Representative' of the Turkish Church.¹³

Meletios IV declared, at that time that the Phanar was considering the difficulty, but was unwilling to take immediate disciplinary action as it feared that the peasant prelates may have

¹¹ *The Speech*, pp. 9-10, 59.

Atatürk Söylev ve Demeçleri, III (1918-1937) (Ankara, 1954), p. 57.

¹² *Times* (London), February 7, 1923; June 29, 1923; and September 25, 1923; *LCNEA*, p. 324.

¹³ Teoman Ergene, *Istiklal Harbinde Türk Ortodoksları* [The Turkish Orthodox in the War of Independence] (Istanbul, 1951), pp. 25-26. This book was in all probability written by Papa Efthim. It presents a detailed account and defense of his program and action as leader of the Turkish Orthodox Church movement. Cf. Clair Price, *The Rebirth of Turkey* (New York, 1925), pp. 147-153.

Earlier, on November 30, 1921, Papa Efthim proclaimed the foundation of the Turkish Orthodox Church, and on December 29, 1921, the Ankara Government discussed the issue, but took no official action. See Gotthard Jäschke and Erich Pritch, "Die Turkei Seit dem Weltkriege Geschichtskalender, 1918-1928" *Die Welt des Islams*, Vol. x, 1927-1929, pp. 56-57.

been coerced into schismatical behavior by the Ankara Government. He explained that the Phanar was willing to meet the Turkish-speaking Orthodox Christians half way by being prepared to set up, in a canonical manner, a special ecclesiastical province, autonomous but subject to the Ecumenical Patriarchate, in which the liturgical language would be Turkish.¹⁴ Papa Efthim answered that only by severing themselves completely from the Phanar, which was subject to a foreign power and on very bad terms with the Ankara Government, would the Turkish Orthodox Christians find peace in Anatolia. He bitterly complained that the Ecumenical Patriarchate and Meletios IV in particular had plotted to undermine the Turkish Orthodox Church movement by removing him from Turkey and by making false promises.¹⁵

At the time, there were about 50,000 Turkish-speaking Orthodox Christians left in Anatolia, who were either descendants of Turks that had embraced Christianity under the Byzantines, or Greeks that had adopted Turkish as a mother tongue in the Seljukid or Ottoman period. It appeared for a while that these Turkish-speaking Christians were to be exempted from the compulsory population-exchange agreement between Turkey and Greece. On December 12, 1922, Lord Curzon declared, at Lausanne, that the exchange of populations would result in the almost complete disappearance of the Greek population from Anatolia, 'though there will, I suppose, remain the reconciled Ottoman Greeks numbered at about 50,000 persons.'¹⁶ On the following day, Ismet Pasha explained that the Orthodox Turks had never asked for treatments differing in any respect from that enjoyed by their Muslim compatriots, and it is most improbable that they would ever make such a request.¹⁷ Apparently, Venizelos also agreed with Lord Curzon and Ismet Pasha that '50,000 Turkish-speaking persons of the Orthodox faith would stay [in Anatolia] in any case.'¹⁸

Notwithstanding the declarations at Lausanne and the growing belief in Ankara that the Turkish-speaking Christians and

¹⁴ *Times* (London), February 7, 1923, p. 9.

¹⁵ Ergene, *op. cit.*, pp. 25-27, 69-70.

¹⁶ LCNEA, p. 208.

¹⁷ LCNEA, p. 208.

¹⁸ LCNEA, p. 224.

many of the Greek-speaking Christians were formerly Turks, all the Greeks and Turkish-speaking Christians of the Orthodox faith in Anatolia were shipped to Greece under the compulsory population-exchange agreement concluded at Lausanne, thus depriving the Turkish Orthodox Church movement of popular support. In Greece, the Turkish-speaking Christians were easily assimilated into the population, as they considered themselves Greeks by race and religion.

THE AbdICATION OF MELETIOS IV

During the Spring of 1923, Papa Efthim, with the aid of the Turkish authorities, seized the church of Panagia Kaphatiani in Galata, Istanbul, and directed a systematic and violent campaign against the Patriarchate.¹⁹ On June 1, 1923, in an obvious attempt to show their allegiance to the Turkish Government and to win its support, supporters of Papa Efthim, led by Damianos Damianides of Galata, attacked the Phanar and injured the Patriarch. The Turkish police, although present throughout the demonstrations, did not interfere, and the French military police (the Allies were still on occupation duty in the City) were called to restore order.²⁰ A few days later Papa Efthim announced to the Turkish press and Government that there was an enemy and adversary of the Turkish people in the Phanar and called for the immediate resignation of Meletios IV. He commended D. Damianides and his followers for assaulting the Patriarchate.²¹

Sensing his precarious position in Turkey, but most reluctant to vacate the Ecumenical Throne, Meletios IV seriously advocated the removal of the Patriarchate to Thessalonica or to Mount Athos. In October 1922, he remarked to Italian newspapermen that it might be necessary to transfer the Patriarchate to Mount Athos if it could not exercise its functions freely in Turkey. In

¹⁹ A. A. Pallis, Εσνητεμένοι "Ελληνες [Greeks Abroad]", (Athens, 1953), p. 184. Mr. Pallis was the Director of the Greek Red Cross at Constantinople and often acted as *liaison* between the Ecumenical Patriarchate and the Turkish and foreign Governments during this period.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 185-186; *Times* (London), June 2 and 4, 1923; September 25, 1923.

²¹ *Times* (London), June 9, 1923. *Ileri* (Istanbul), June 2 and 9, 1923, quoted in Ministère des Affaires Etrangères, *Bulletin Periodique de la Presse Turque* (Paris), No. 29, September 13, 1923, p. 9. Hereafter cited as *B.P.P.T.*

the same month, the Holy Synod met twice to discuss the transfer of the Patriarchate to a place outside of Turkey.²² After the attacks against the Patriarchate in June, 1923, Meletios IV renewed his bid to relocate the Patriarchate. He reasoned with Mr. Alexander A. Pallis, the Director of the Greek Red Cross in Turkey, that although the Patriarchate was allowed to remain in Kemalist Turkey, the limitations imposed upon it by the Turkish authorities would weaken its prestige and authority in the Orthodox world. As a result of the exchange of population only a few Greeks would be allowed to remain in Turkey, and such a situation would render it very difficult to find intelligent and able clerics with the necessary Turkish citizenship to assume the vacancies in the Holy Synod and the church administration. The future of the Patriarchate, he pleaded, could only be assured by removing it outside the boundaries of Turkey. Pallis, voicing the opinion of the Greek Government, replied that as long as Greeks were settled in Constantinople the Ecumenical Patriarchate should remain in that city.²³

Meletios IV again presented the issue of the removal of the Patriarchate to the Holy Synod and dispatched a telegram to his friend Venizelos at Lausanne, requesting his advice on this matter. Pallis was with Meletios IV when the latter received the counsel of Venizelos to abdicate. According to Pallis, Meletios IV was much incensed at this recommendation, but decided to follow it because it was supported by the Greek Government. Notwithstanding several changes of mind, he finally withdrew from Constantinople on July 10, 1923, to a monastery on Mount Athos.²⁴

The aspirations of Meletios IV and the objectives of Greek

²² *Oriente Moderne* (Rome), November 15, 1922, pp. 382-383. Hereafter cited as *O.M.*

²³ Pallis, *op. cit.*, pp. 186-187.

Unpublished interview with A. A. Pallis, April 7, 1958, Athens.

During this transition period, the Turkish Government might have approved the removal of the Patriarchate to one of the Turkish islands in the Sea of Marmora. Such a transfer would have had the advantage of retaining the Patriarchate within the historical limits of Constantinople and at the same time of making it less vulnerable to Turkish pressure.

²⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 187.

Vatan (Istanbul), June 26, 1923 (*B.P.P.T.*, No. 29, September 13, 1923, p. 9).

Times (London), June 27, 1923.

foreign policy were clearly at odds. In January 1923, Venizelos had assured İsmet Pasha at Lausanne that Meletios IV would abdicate, and to the Greek press he announced that the maintenance of the Patriarchate at Constantinople was an important Hellenic interest and that Meletios IV would resign immediately following the conclusion of peace. 'He [Meletios] agrees on this point.' Although he was a personal friend of Meletios IV, Venizelos felt that his removal would improve the situation of the Patriarchate and that of the Greek minority in Turkey.²⁵ On the other hand, Meletios IV was very reluctant to abdicate, at least not until normal relations between the Orthodox Church and the Turkish Government were reestablished and the future of those relations properly secured; he refused to believe that normal relations could be obtained only by his abdication. Although he withdrew from Turkey, he did not abdicate; instead, he appointed Nicholas, Metropolitan of Caesaria, as *locum tenens* and continued his campaign to win support for the transference of the Ecumenical Patriarchate to Greece.²⁶ Meletios was a very active person whose good judgment was often marred by his ambition. Notwithstanding this trait, he did much to improve the position of the Ecumenical Patriarchate in its relations with the other Orthodox Churches, and his concern for his Church was real. The future of the Patriarchate was left in complete uncertainty, and for a while it appeared that the Patriarchate would either be treated as extinct, or reconstituted in such a fashion that its composition and direction would be identical with Papa Efthim's Turkish Orthodox Church.

When Meletios IV withdrew from Turkey, Papa Efthim intensified his efforts in Ankara to gain support for his church program and, although married and the father of four children, to have himself nominated Ecumenical Patriarch. Upon his return to Constantinople in the Autumn of 1923, the Turkish press gave his proposed project full and sympathetic coverage; his plans seemed to be close to realization.²⁷

On October 2, 1923, an hour before the Allied evacuation of Constantinople was completed, Papa Efthim, accompanied by an

²⁵ Ηαρού (Athens), January 20, 1923 (O.M., February 15, 1923, p. 527).

²⁶ Times (London), July 12, 1923, p. 14.

²⁷ B.P.P.T., No. 31, November 19, 1923, p. 10.

adequate body of Turkish police and some of his partisans, forced his way into the room where the Holy Synod was in session and presented an ultimatum to the attending bishops ordering them within ten minutes to declare Meletios IV deposed. In spite of the vigorous protest of two of the eight members of the Holy Synod, the required declaration was voted for, and six of the eight members of the Holy Synod, whose Sees were situated outside the boundaries of Turkey, along with the Patriarch's *locum tenens*, were virtually expelled from the Phanar. Papa Efthim then announced that he intended to remain at the Patriarchate until seven new members, nominated by him, were admitted to the Holy Synod and a new Ecumenical Patriarch, agreeable to Ankara, was elected. His demands, save for the election of a new Patriarch, were conceded, and he returned to Ankara as the 'official representative' of the Phanar.²⁸

The bold and theatrical actions of Papa Efthim resulted in adverse criticism and a reversal of public opinion. His violence and arrogance were publicly reprimanded and officially disavowed. Hüseyin Cahid, the editor of *Tanin*, declared that his first impulse was to laugh at Papa Efthim's vaudevillesque actions, but argued that they were really serious, and that while it was admittedly impossible for Meletios IV to remain Ecumenical Patriarch and that a change was necessary, it would have been possible to arrange the affair in accordance with the interests as well as the honor of the State. If, he continued, Papa Efthim acted on his own responsibility, he should be punished for the outrage, whereas if he acted with the knowledge of the authorities, then such conduct was unworthy of a properly constituted government. The Turkish Press Bureau, on October 12th, reported that the Ankara Government received with astonishment the nomination of Papa Efthim as 'official representative' of the Phanar at Ankara, and denied that the Patriarchate, a purely religious organization, had the right to send such a representative to them.²⁹

The change in attitude of the Turkish Government was also

²⁸ *Times* (London), October 3 and 6, 1923.

²⁹ *Times* (London), October 6, 1923.

Tanin (Istanbul), October 5, 1923 (B.P.P.T., No. 31, November 19, 1923, p. 11) and October 6, 1923 (O.M., October 15, 1923, p. 372).

Luke, *op. cit.*, p. 213.

influenced by internal difficulties, by Christian public opinion abroad, and by the correct behavior of the Greek Government. Although Papa Efthim's actions caused considerable indignation and animosity in Greece and the Orthodox world, the Greek Government, on October 12th, reported to the press that it was desirous of reestablishing friendly relations with Turkey and was prepared to recognize a new Ecumenical Patriarch at Constantinople, provided that his election was carried out strictly in accordance with the ecclesiastical rules and regulations. On the same day, Chrysostom, the Metropolitan of Athens, was sent to Thessalonica to obtain the abdication of Meletios IV. The Greek Government and Venizelos were opposed to the plans of Meletios IV, who appeared determined to remove (temporarily) the Patriarchate to Thessalonica, for fear that once removed the Turks would never permit the restoration of the Patriarchate in Turkey. They told Meletios IV that the creation of another Patriarchate at Thessalonica would be against the best interests of the Orthodox Church.³⁰

Meletios IV finally gave in to the reasoning of the Greek Government, and the document of abdication was actually signed when news was received of Papa Efthim's incursions. The official document containing the formal and canonical abdication of the Ecumenical Patriarch was dated September 20, 1923, and was to be read at the meeting of the Holy Synod scheduled for November 10, 1923. But the activities of Papa Efthim prompted Meletios IV to postpone the announcement of his abdication.³¹ However, under pressure from all sides, he abdicated, and the Holy Synod received friendly instructions from the Turkish Government to make ready for a new election with the understanding that the new Patriarch would be a Turkish subject, sympathetic to Turkey, and elected by Turkish subjects.³²

GREGORIOS VII

On December 6, 1923, Gregorios, Metropolitan of Chalcedon,

³⁰ *Times* (London), October 13, 1923.

³¹ *Times* (London), November 21, 1923.

O.M., November 15, 1923, p. 349.

Technically the document of abdication rendered the illegal acts of Papa Efthim invalid.

³² *Times* (London), November 21, 1923, and December 7, 1923.

was elected Ecumenical Patriarch by a vote of ten to one, and, after vehement opposition from Papa Efthim, was enthroned as Gregorios VII on December 13. On the day following the election and prior to the enthronement, Papa Efthim, who was not allowed to attend the election, and his protégé, Kyrillos, Metropolitan of Rhodopolis, again descended upon the Phanar, drove out all its occupants, and declared that in his position as 'general procurator' he had taken over the Holy Synod and would continue to occupy the Phanar until a new election for a legitimate Patriarch took place. In an open letter to Gregorios, he wrote, 'You know that you do not have the confidence of the [Turkish] Government. By accepting the office of Patriarch you have harmed the interests of the community. I advise you to resign.'⁸³

However, two days later the Turkish police, with orders from Ankara, expelled Papa Efthim and his followers from the Phanar and restored it to its legal occupants. The Turkish Minister of Justice explained in the Grand National Assembly that the Patriarchate was solely a religious institution and that the election of Gregorios VII had the approval of the Turkish Government. 'So far as the Government is concerned, the Patriarch is the head of the priests, and the Government has the right to watch over his election, in which the candidates and voters must be Turkish subjects. The Government does not know of any foreign intervention nor believes it possible; if it had discovered such intervention the election would have been annulled.' On December 25, Kemal Pasha sent Gregorios VII a telegram thanking him for his favorable expressions toward the Republic.⁸⁴

The second crisis in the reign of Gregorios VII resulted from the dissolution of the Caliphate in Turkey, March 1924. *Aksam* and the other Turkish newspapers proposed that as a natural complement to the abolition of the Caliphate, the Ecumenical Patriarchate should be removed from Turkey. *Tanin*, however, urged its readers not to confuse the issue of the Caliphate with that of the Ecumenical Patriarchate. It was impossible, it stated, to suppress the Patriarchate because of commitments made at

⁸³ *O.M.*, January 15, 1924, p. 30.

⁸⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 31.

Papa Efthim was subsequently defrocked (February 19, 1924) by the Holy Synod for his irregular behavior. *Ileri*, February 20, 1924 (*B.P.P.T.*, No. 34, May 3, 1924, p. 13).

Lausanne.⁸⁵ Although Kemal Pasha was reported to have said, 'Now that the Caliphate has been suppressed, it should be necessary also to suppress the Patriarchate,' the Turkish Government remained loyal to its pledges given at Lausanne.⁸⁶ In spite of the constant charges that Gregorios VII was working for the interests of Greece and that he was an agent of the Greek foreign office, and notwithstanding the incursions of Papa Efthim and the reaction resulting from the dissolution of the Caliphate, the eleven-month reign of the Patriarch was a comparatively peaceful one, and he achieved what relatively few Patriarchs before him were able to achieve—a quiet death in office (November 16, 1924).⁸⁷

CONSTANTINE VI

The comparative calm was broken by the stormy events following the election of Constantine Araboğlu on December 17, 1924, as the new Patriarch. His election generated such a bitter quarrel between Turkey and Greece that war appeared imminent. Prior to his election, the Turkish press gave due warning that Constantine Araboğlu was not eligible for the Patriarchal Throne because he was not a native of Constantinople as defined in Article 2 of the Convention Concerning the Exchange of Greek and Turkish Populations signed at Lausanne, January 30, 1923. On the day before his election, the Turkish police reiterated the warning, and the exchangeability of the cleric was referred for a ruling to the Mixed Commission for the Exchange of Populations after the Constantinople sub-commission declined to give a decision on this delicate matter.⁸⁸

Meanwhile, the Turkish Legation in Athens, anticipating the reaction of Greece to these proceedings, issued a *communiqué* on December 30, 1924, assuring Greece that Turkey would respect the Patriarchate, but maintaining that the new Patriarch, Constantine VI, by virtue of being born outside the city of Constan-

⁸⁵ *O.M.*, March 15, 1924, p. 177 and April 15, 1924, p. 210.

Vatan, March 10 and 13, 1924; *Aksam*, March 12 and 13, 1924; and *Vakit*, March 11, 1924 quoted in *B.P.P.T.*, No. 34, May 3, 1924, p. 13.

⁸⁶ *Times* (London), May 6, 1924.

⁸⁷ *B.P.P.T.*, No. 38, February 21, 1925, p. 6-7.

Echos d'Orient (Paris), Vol. XXIII (1924), pp. 23-101.

Times (London), December 8 and 16, 1923.

⁸⁸ *B.P.P.T.*, No. 38, February 21, 1925, p. 7.

Times (London), December 18, 1924.

tinople, albeit in Turkey, was an exchangeable Greek as defined in Articles 1 and 2 of the exchange Convention. The *communiqué* announced that the Turkish Government deplored the exaggerated impressions given by the Greek press that the Ecumenical Patriarchate was in danger, and was waiting for the decision of the Mixed Commission before taking action against the Patriarch.³⁹

On January 28, 1925, the Mixed Commission, with the abstention of its Greek members, made the following declaration:⁴⁰

' . . . while noting the facts contained in the report of the Sixth Sub-Committee, No. 2360, dated December 17, 1924, in regard to the possibility of exchanging Mgr. Constantine Araboğlu, former Metropolitan of Dercos, according to which Mgr. Constantine Araboğlu, having been born in Asia Minor and having gone to Constantinople after October 30, 1918, fulfilling in his person all the conditions necessary for the purpose of exchange, holds that it is beyond its competence to take a decision in regard to the case of this ecclesiastic in view of the fact that he is a Metropolitan.'

The verdict of the Mixed Commission was evasive. It would neither give, nor refuse to give, an exit passport to Constantine Araboğlu, and at no time referred to him as Ecumenical Patriarch.⁴¹

(a) *The Expulsion of Constantine VI*

Greek public opinion was outraged when on January 30, 1925, the Turkish police abruptly removed Constantine VI from Turkish territory.⁴² In the Greek Parliament, the Prime Minister, Mr. A. Michalakopoulos, declared that the expulsion of the Patriarch would greatly obstruct the Government's desire to reëstab-

³⁹ *Times* (London), December 31, 1924.

O.M., February 15, 1925, p. 97.

⁴⁰ League of Nations, *Official Journal*, April 1925, p. 483. Hereafter cited as *L.N.O.J.*

⁴¹ *Times* (London), January 30, 1925.

'Ελεύθερον Βῆμα (Athens), February 3, 1925. Hereafter cited as *E.V.* Department of State, *Monthly Political Report*, Serial 23, No. 7, February 1925, pp. 12-14.

⁴² *Le Messager d'Athènes*, January 31, 1925.

Large demonstrations were held all over Greece in protest over the expulsion of the Patriarch. The refugee groups were especially active in these demonstrations.

lish normal relations with Turkey. Most members of Parliament felt that the act was a grave insult to the Greek people and the civilized world.⁴³ On February 1, the Greek protest against the expulsion of the Patriarch was conveyed to the Turkish Government along with a notice that Greece intended to appeal her case to the League of Nations, as the Turkish action was a clear violation of the Treaty of Lausanne and threatened the peace. The Greek member of the Mixed Commission, G. A. Exindaris, tendered his resignation, characterizing the Turkish Government's treatment of the Patriarch as worse than that accorded the *hamals* (porters) of Constantinople; the Patriarch was expelled without time to pack his personal belongings. He warned Turkey that her action would hurt her, as it would arouse the anger not only of the Greeks, but of all Christendom. He claimed that since the Mixed Commission did not issue Constantine VI a passport nor ask him to leave the country, the Turks had no legal right to expel him. He argued that the exchange of population was not an internal affair, as the Turks seemed to think, but an international matter in which only the Mixed Commission had the authority to decide who was to be exchanged.⁴⁴

The Turkish press responded with naïve surprise at the indignation of the Greeks over the removal of Constantine VI from Turkey. It enthusiastically supported the expulsion and declared that the Turkish Government would regard any foreign *démarche* on behalf of the Phanar as an intrusion in the internal affairs of the country. Several newspapers, including Yunus Nadi's *Cumhuriyet*, advocated the exchange of all the Greeks of Constantinople for the Turks of Western Thrace, 'as it would *ipso facto* abolish the *raison d'être* of the Phanar.' *Vatan* reported that Papa Efthim would establish a new Patriarchate, and most of the newspapers declared that Turkey would not be intimidated by Greece. 'Even though Greece is prepared for war, she is too busy in the Balkans to be a threat to Turkey.' *Istiklal* stated that as the Caliphate was abolished so must Turkey expel the Patriarchate; 'we cannot allow the Greeks to have a foreign organ in our country.'⁴⁵ *Tanin*, however, cautioned the Government not to

⁴³ *Proceedings of the Greek Parliament*, January 30, 1925, pp. 86-87. *Times* (London), January 31, 1925.

⁴⁴ *E.V.*, February 3, 1925.

⁴⁵ *B.P.P.T.*, No. 39, April 21, 1925, p. 3.

impose its view on the question of the Patriarchate and criticized Ankara for reawakening an anti-European fanaticism among the people at a time when conciliation with Europe was necessary. The Mosul question and internal problems, it insisted, were far more important than any advantage resulting from the expulsion of the Ecumenical Patriarchate.⁴⁶

On February 2, the Turkish Legation in Athens announced that the Patriarch was found exchangeable because he was born in Anatolia and came to Constantinople after October 30, 1918. Turkey does not wish to destroy the Patriarchate; the Greeks must merely elect a non-exchangeable person to that institution according to Turkish law. Turkey, it continued, desires peace and friendship with Greece, but cannot tolerate meddling in her internal affairs.⁴⁷

On February 4, the Turkish Prime Minister, Fethi Bey, delivered a speech in the Turkish Grand National Assembly in response to the Greek note on the expulsion of the Patriarch. He warned Greece that Turkey refused to be intimidated and that the Greek note was considered unfriendly by the Turkish Government, as the Patriarchate was a purely domestic institution. He accused the Greeks of efforts to incite Christendom against them and of entertaining hostile intentions against Turkey. He argued:

'As you know from the debates at Lausanne, the Turkish delegation asked that the Patriarch be removed from Constantinople and even wanted to exchange the Greeks of Constantinople. After the Great Powers and Greece assured us that the Patriarchate would not meddle in politics, the leader of our delegation, Ismet Pasha, announced his consent to retain the Patriarchate in Turkey. These declarations were inserted in the verbatim proceedings—one does not find them in any article of the Treaty. It could not be otherwise since Turkey would not accept a document or an international engagement relative to a question of a purely domestic nature.'⁴⁸

On the same day, Cevat Bey, the Turkish Ambassador to Paris, reported to the press that Greece should keep out of Turkish

⁴⁶ *E.V.*, February 5, 1925.

⁴⁷ *Ibid.*

⁴⁸ *B.P.P.T.*, No. 39, April 21, 1925, p. 3.

affairs and that Turkey would not accept any decision of the League of Nations or the Hague Court on this matter. If there is a threat to the peace, as the Greeks claim, it is they who have instigated this threat.^{48*} Tevfik Rüştü Bey (Aras), in Rome, declared that the expulsion of the Patriarch was in order, and that the only thing left to be done was to elect a new Patriarch who was not exchangeable.⁴⁹

The Turks felt that the Holy Synod, knowing the position of Constantine VI and being, in addition, notified of his ineligible status, had deliberately elected him Patriarch to hinder the normal resumption of Turco-Greek relations. They considered it a political move contrary to the decisions which had effected the retention of the Patriarchate in Turkey. Their case was simply that the expulsion of Constantine VI was merely putting into effect the decision of the Mixed Commission, which found the person of Constantine Araboğlu exchangeable under the terms of the exchange Convention. Fethi Bey made it clear that the expulsion of Constantine Araboğlu did not mean that the Turkish Government would not honor its pledge given at Lausanne to retain the Ecumenical Patriarchate at Constantinople. However, he insisted that the voting members of the Holy Synod and the elected Patriarch had to be Turkish subjects as defined by Article 3 of the Convention Concerning the Exchange of Greek and Turkish Populations. The Greek view for the retention of Metropolitans in Turkey on the basis of 'position' was unacceptable.⁵⁰

The Greeks insisted that Constantine VI was not exchangeable because his 'establishment at Constantinople dated from the year 1902, the date when he was appointed a Metropolitan and thus gaining permanent residence in that city,' all Metropolitans being members of the monastery of the Phanar at Constantinople. They also claimed that the Patriarch was protected from deportation by İsmet Pasha's promise that the Patriarchate would be al-

^{48*} *E.V.*, January 31 and February 3, 1925.

Times (London), February 2, 1925.

'Ἐκκλησία' (official organ of the Church of Greece), No. 8, February 21, 1925, p. 61.

⁴⁹ *B.P.P.T.*, No. 39, April 21, 1925, pp. 3-4.

E.V., February 1, 2 and 3, 1925.

Times (London), February 2, 1925.

⁵⁰ *Tanin*, February 5, 1925 (*O.M.*, February 15, 1925, p. 97).

lowed to remain in Turkey as a purely religious institution, since the Patriarch was the most essential component of the Patriarchate.⁵¹ The Turkish action, they argued, was contrary to the exchange Convention, which stipulated that only the Mixed Commission had the right to issue passports to decide who was to be exchanged. The real issue for them was that on basis of the Turkish approach all but three of the Metropolitans who composed the Holy Synod of the Ecumenical Patriarchate, having arrived at Constantinople after October 1918, were exchangeable subjects. If Turkey had her way over the expulsion of Constantine VI, what would prevent her from deporting the remaining 'exchangeable' prelates? Such an admission would be tantamount to the abolition of the Ecumenical Patriarchate in Turkey, as canon law required that the Patriarch be elected by a Holy Synod of twelve Metropolitans.⁵²

(b) *The Greek Appeal to the League*

On February 11, 1925, the Greek Prime Minister, Mr. A. Michalakopoulos, requested under the provisions of paragraph 2, article 11, of the League Covenant that the world organization consider the question of the Ecumenical Patriarchate. He declared that the expulsion of the Patriarch was a hostile act which threatened the peace, and telegraphed to the League the following message:⁵³

"The Greek Government states that the measure taken against the Patriarch by the Turkish authorities constitutes a serious infringement of the Lausanne agreements regarding the Patriarchate, an infringement of Article 12 of the Convention for the Exchange of Greek and Turkish Populations, and of the Mixed Commission's decision of January 28, 1925, and, further, that it is contrary to the understanding given on October 31, 1924, at Brussels by Turkey loyally to carry out all decisions that might be adopted by the major-

⁵¹ *Times* (London), February 2, 1925, p. 11.

⁵² *M.A.*, February 1, 1925.

Times (London), February 3, 1925.

'Εκκλησία (Athens), No. 10, March 7, 1925, pp. 73-74; and Noll, March 14, 1925, p. 85.

⁵³ *L.N.O.J.*, (April 1925), p. 578.

ity of the Mixed Commission for the Exchange of Populations.'

In response, the Turkish Government sent the following telegram, dated March 1, to the League in support of its position:⁵⁴

'The Patriarchate is a Turkish domestic institution, the constitution and administration of which are governed by Turkish laws and regulations, and there are no provisions whatsoever in any Treaty in which a contrary view could be based; there is, moreover, no clause giving one or several foreign powers the right to intervene in the constitution and the administration of this institution; furthermore, notwithstanding the assertions contained in the Greek Government's telegram neither the Treaty of Lausanne nor the agreements, conventions, declarations, protocols and letters signed at that place contain the slightest allusion to the Patriarchate. . . . It is obvious that the Greek Government wishes to take advantage of this opportunity to endeavor to make the Patriarchate into an international institution and so interfere in Turkish domestic affair, whereas, as we have already stated, no international treaty or convention contains any provisions regarding that institution. . . .'

The Turks refused to send a representative before the League to plead their case; Turkey was not a member of the League, and denied that the League had jurisdiction in this matter.

At the Council meeting of March 14, 1925, the Greek representative, Mr. D. Kaklamanos, assured the League that Greece did not want to interfere in the internal affairs of Turkey, but that 'the maintenance of the Patriarchate of Constantinople had been one of the provisions of international agreements.'⁵⁵ On the same day, the Council adopted the following resolution for a decision by the Permanent Court of International Justice at the Hague:

'Do the objections of the competence of the Council raised by the Turkish Government in its letter of March 1 which is communicated to the Court, preclude the Council from being competent in the matter brought before it by the Greek Government by its telegram to the Secretary-General of the League of Nations dated February 11, 1925.'

⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 580-581.

⁵⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 482.

It also adopted a resolution directing Greece and Turkey to settle the dispute privately, and suggested that they might use the good offices of the neutral members of the Mixed Commission.⁵⁶

The earlier negotiations between Mr. G. A. Exindaris and Tevfik Rüştü Bey for the settlement of the Patriarchal problem were deadlocked. Turkey wanted Greece to withdraw her application for the settlement of the question from the League, and the open direct negotiations between the two Governments for a satisfactory solution of the problem. On February 23, 1925, the *Vali* (Governor) of Constantinople, Süleyman Sami Bey, took a conciliatory step by informing the Holy Synod, which was then in session, that he would try to arrange a non-exchangeable status for its members and for which, in return, he expected the Holy Synod to obtain the abdication of Constantine VI and to proceed with the election of a non-exchangeable Patriarch.⁵⁷

The Greeks seemed to feel that the Turkish promises were too vague and refused to withdraw their application from the League.⁵⁸ By bringing the case to the League, they hoped, once and for all, to establish the international character of the Ecumenical Patriarchate so as to prevent the complete subjection of that institution to the whim of the Turkish Government, and to avoid, in future, conflicts with Turkey arising out of the unsettled status of the Patriarchate.

(c) *The Success of Direct Negotiations*

For several weeks following the expulsion of the Patriarch,

⁵⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 488.

At the discussions before the Court as to the meaning of the word *établis*, the Greek Government sought a decision of the Court exempting from exchange high ecclesiastical dignitaries of the Orthodox Church. In the Court opinion given on February 21, 1925, the Court declined to consider the question, as its opinion on ecclesiastical matters had not been asked for by the League. See "Documents Relating to Advisory Opinion No. 10, Series C. (Lausanne Convention VI, January 30, 1923, Article 2)" *PCIJ*, No. 7-1, Sixth Extraordinary Session. Leyden: A. W. Sijthoff's Publishing Co., 1925, 261 pp. and *Publications of the Permanent Court of International Justice*, Series B, No. 10, February 21, 1925, Collection of Advisory Opinions, "Exchange of Greek and Turkish Populations (Lausanne Convention) VI, January 30, 1923, Article 2" (Leyden, 1925), 28 pp.

⁵⁷ *Times* (London), February 25, 1925.

⁵⁸ *Times* (London), March 2, 1925.

the press of both countries denounced and berated each other, and rumors of Turkish and Greek troop movements along their common Thracian border were rife. But towards the end of March, the readiness of the Turkish Government to come to an understanding with the Ecumenical Patriarchate, and the sudden improvement of Graeco-Turkish relations in general, eased the tense situation. The refugee-settlement problem, constitutional issues, and the political isolation of Greece, and in Turkey the elimination of political opposition, the Kurdish revolts, the problem of internal reform, and the general feeling that the Western world and the League were hostile to Turkish interests, especially in the regions of Mosul and Alexandretta (İskenderum), were factors which contributed to the resumption of negotiations between the two states.

Tanin declared on February 12 that it was afraid the Government would impose its point of view on the question of the Patriarchate and that in attempting to preserve its prestige it might give in on Mosul, thereby losing a lot more than it would gain by expelling the Patriarchate. This is why, it explained, the British attitude towards the expulsion of the Patriarchate was very reserved and almost neutral.

By April, it was apparent that both Turkey and Greece wished to settle all the issues outstanding between them. The trip of John Politis, the newly appointed Greek representative, to Ankara was viewed favorably by the Turkish press, and the newspapers of both countries reported that agreements on the exchange-of-populations question, which had marred Graeco-Turkish relations since 1923, were soon to be concluded.⁵⁹ In this friendly atmosphere, and in exchange for a Turkish promise to extend non-exchangeable status to the members of the Holy Synod, excepting Constantine VI, the Greek Government resumed direct negotiations with Turkey for the settlement of the issue concerning the Ecumenical Patriarchate. It urged Constantine VI to abdicate and asked the fifty-eight Metropolitans whose dioceses belonged to the Ecumenical Patriarchate (although they had been located in Greece since 1912) to accept the abdication, as it would help to better relations with Turkey and to improve the lot of the

⁵⁹ *E.V.*, April 9 and 15, 1925.

Greek minority in Constantinople.⁶⁰ On May 19, Constantine VI informed the Greek Government that he was forwarding his abdication to the Holy Synod of Constantinople. The Greek press expressed the hope that his personal sacrifice would reopen the way for more cordial relations between the two countries and that agreements on the population-exchange question, which it felt would shortly be signed in Ankara, would lead to a Graeco-Turkish *rapprochement*.⁶¹

The abdication of the Patriarch was accepted on May 26, and three days later in Ankara, G. A. Exindaris reported that the Turkish Government had assured him that the election of the new Patriarch would be orderly and proper. The authorities in Constantinople were directed to prevent Papa Efthim or anyone else from making trouble at the Phanar.⁶² On June 8, the Greek Government informed the League, in a letter dated June 1, that the negotiations between Greece and Turkey on the subject of the Ecumenical Patriarchate had been successfully concluded.⁶³

' . . . the Turkish representative of the Mixed Commission for the Exchange of Greek and Turkish Populations in a letter to the Greek member of the Mixed Commission has declared that he withdraws definitely the dossiers relating to the exchangeability of the members of the Holy Synod. The question having therefore been settled, and the Greek Patriarch having abdicated, the Holy Synod will proceed with the

⁶⁰ *E.V.*, May 3, 1925; D. Gatopoulos, *Andreas Michalakopoulos, 1875-1938* (Athens, 1947), p. 228.

The diocese areas annexed to Greece after 1912 still come under the jurisdiction of the Ecumenical Patriarchate, and their Metropolitans are members of the Holy Synod at Constantinople. However, according to Turkish law only Turkish subjects can vote for a new Patriarch. In order to comply with the canon law and the Turkish law, an arrangement has been worked out whereby the Metropolitans of Turkey vote on certain issues, and the non-Turkish Metropolitans of the Holy Synod almost automatically approve their decisions.

⁶¹ *Times* (London), May 21, 1925.

⁶² *E.V.*, May 30, 1925.

Unpublished interview with Constantine Rendis, Athens, April 9, 1958. Mr. Rendis was the Greek Foreign Minister in 1925 and a close friend of Tevfik Rüştü Bey, who became Turkish Foreign Minister the same year. The Greek Government, he said, recognized from the beginning that the Patriarch should be *persona grata* to the Turkish Government.

⁶³ *L.N.O.J.* (July 1925).

election of a new Patriarch. The Greek Government, therefore, withdraws its request of February 11, 1925, to the League Council, and begs it to inform the Permanent Court of International Justice of the solution of the question.'

On July 13, notwithstanding the renewed proposals of Papa Efthim and his followers that the Turkish Government should participate in the elections, the Holy Synod, in a quiet atmosphere, freely and canonically elected Basil Georgiades, Metropolitan of Nicæa, as the Ecumenical Patriarch Basil III.⁶⁴

THE ECONOMIC AND POLITICAL SETTLEMENT OF 1930

After the final settlement of the population-exchange question and the beginning of political coöperation between Greece and Turkey in 1930, the Ecumenical Patriarchate ceased to be a major concern in Græco-Turkish diplomacy. In May 1931, Kemal reassured Venizelos, the Greek Premier since 1928, that he would keep Papa Efthim out of the affairs of the Patriarchate.⁶⁵ Although Papa Efthim was important to the Turkish Nationalists, who emphasized the ties of blood between the Turkish peoples, psychologically the majority of the Muslim Turkish people were not prepared to accept non-Muslims as brothers. We must look elsewhere to explain the connection of Papa Efthim and the Turkish Government. It seems certain that he was merely another pawn in the hands of the Turkish diplomats at Lausanne and after. As soon as the outstanding issues between Greece and Turkey were resolved, the project for a Turkish Orthodox Church

⁶⁴ *B.P.P.T.*, No. 40, June 18, 1925, p. 11.

M.A., July 12 and 15, 1925.

⁶⁵ Unpublished interview with Leon Maccas, Athens, April 3, 1958. Mr. Maccas was a close associate of Venizelos and was for many years associated with the Press Section of the Greek Ministry for Foreign Affairs. He was also a deputy of the Liberal Party in the Greek Parliament. He received the assurances mentioned above on behalf of the Greek Government during an interview with Kemal Pasha.

Unpublished interview with V. P. Papadakis, Athens, April 12, 1958. Mr. Papadakis was a long time member of the Greek Ministry for Foreign Affairs and served as political advisor to the Metaxas régime. In 1930, the Turkish Government asked Venizelos to restrain or expel certain Muslim religious leaders who were seeking to restore the Caliphate and to prejudice the Turkish minority in Greece against the Turkish Government. Mr. Papadakis suggested to Venizelos that in return for the Turkish request, Greece ought to insist on a Turkish guarantee which would keep Papa Efthim out of the affairs of the Phanar.

sank into oblivion and Papa Efthim was no longer posed as a threat to the Phanar.

The improved relations between Greece and Turkey, and the Ecumenical Patriarchate and Turkey, were illustrated by an incident which occurred during the visit of Venizelos to Turkey. In October, 1930, Venizelos was invited to Turkey to sign a treaty of friendship with the Ankara Government, and to discuss measures for establishing better relations between the two countries. He declined to go to Ankara via the railway center at Haydar Paşa, an Anatolian suburb of metropolitan Constantinople, explaining that if he visited Constantinople he would be obliged to visit the Ecumenical Patriarch, and that this might strain relations with the Turks; whereas, if he journeyed through Haydar Paşa without visiting the Phanar, the Greeks would be offended. The Turkish Government, however, assured him that a visit to the Phanar would be in order, and he passed through Haydar Paşa to Ankara, and upon his return visited the Patriarchate, where he was enthusiastically received by Turks and Greeks alike.⁶⁶

The execution of the Graeco-Turkish agreement concerning the population exchange on June 10, 1930, and the Graeco-Turkish Treaty of Friendship of October 31, 1930, provided a healthier atmosphere for the activities and progress of the Ecumenical Patriarchate. The long struggle, partially due to the erroneous assumption on the part of Papa Efthim, Meletios IV, and others that the Patriarchate was preëminently a culturo-political institution, ended in a reaffirmation of the status of the Ecumenical Patriarchate as laid down by the Lausanne settlement. The right of the Patriarchate to remain in Constantinople was recognized, and the Turkish demand that the Patriarch be *persona grata* to the Turkish Government and that he refrain from political activity inimical to Turkish interests was confirmed. Although the old suspicions toward the Patriarchate remained, it was allowed to function rather freely, provided that relations between Athens and Ankara were cordial. The well-being of the Ecumenical Patriarchate was, and is, largely dependent upon the temper of Graeco-Turkish diplomacy.

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

⁶⁶ *Times* (London), October 25 and 27, 1930; November 3, 1930.
Gregorios Daphni, 'Η 'Ελλάς μεταξύ δύο πολέμων, 1923-1940 [Greece Between Two Wars, 1923-1940], II, (Athens, 1955), p. 483.



Copyright and Use:

As an ATLAS user, you may print, download, or send articles for individual use according to fair use as defined by U.S. and international copyright law and as otherwise authorized under your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement.

No content may be copied or emailed to multiple sites or publicly posted without the copyright holder(s)' express written permission. Any use, decompiling, reproduction, or distribution of this journal in excess of fair use provisions may be a violation of copyright law.

This journal is made available to you through the ATLAS collection with permission from the copyright holder(s). The copyright holder for an entire issue of a journal typically is the journal owner, who also may own the copyright in each article. However, for certain articles, the author of the article may maintain the copyright in the article. Please contact the copyright holder(s) to request permission to use an article or specific work for any use not covered by the fair use provisions of the copyright laws or covered by your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement. For information regarding the copyright holder(s), please refer to the copyright information in the journal, if available, or contact ATLA to request contact information for the copyright holder(s).

About ATLAS:

The ATLA Serials (ATLAS®) collection contains electronic versions of previously published religion and theology journals reproduced with permission. The ATLAS collection is owned and managed by the American Theological Library Association (ATLA) and received initial funding from Lilly Endowment Inc.

The design and final form of this electronic document is the property of the American Theological Library Association.

BOOK REVIEWS

FRANZ CUMONT, *Oriental Religions in Roman Paganism*. New York: Dover Publications, 1956. Pp. xxiv, 298.

The study of history is to a great extent the study of religion. Throughout the aeons of human civilization, history and religion go hand in hand. There is no recorded historical age which does not make apparent the religious nature of man. Independent of content and form, the religious phenomenon has played a major role in the life of mankind.

This becomes evident as we study not only the history of the ancient world before the 4th century B.C., but the Hellenistic Age and the Christian beginnings as well. Religion as a psychological, sociological, historical and spiritual force did a great deal to shape what is characteristically called Graeco-Roman civilization. In fact, our modern civilization and culture were determined to a great measure by the interrelation of Greek culture, Roman elements of law and administration, and the religions and cults of the East. Religion contributed immensely to expedite the amalgamation of the Graeco-Roman world.

In relation to these thoughts, the distinguished Belgian historian Franz Cumont presents in the present work, which is the English translation of his original *Les religions orientales dans le paganisme romain*, the meeting of Roman pagan religion and Oriental religions and cults. The result of this meeting was decisive upon Rome. The various cults and religious beliefs of the East came to exert a great influence upon Roman paganism. By the year 204 B.C., Oriental religious beliefs were introduced into Roman society. Roman religious life was in a state of moral degeneration and decline. The Oriental cults and religions contributed to a revival of paganism in Rome. Roman paganism imbued with Oriental religious principles went through a reorganization which paved the way for eventual religious unity.

The author states in his prologue that the study of Oriental religions is very important, for their propagation in the Roman Empire was "the leading fact in the moral history of the pagan empire" (p. xv). When the author speaks about "Oriental religions" he does not in-

clude Christianity. His reference to Christianity and its relation to the Roman world is incidental. Yet he believes that "we can understand the Christianity of the fifth century and its greatness and weaknesses, its spiritual exaltation and its puerile superstitions if we know the moral antecedents of the world in which it developed" (p. xxiv).

Thus for Cumont the ancient Oriental religious beliefs and cults constitute the moral antecedents of the Christian Roman Empire. They contributed to the "long continued effort of Roman society, contented for many centuries with a rather insipid idolatry, toward more elevated and more profound forms of worship" (p. xxiv).

Following his illuminating preface, the author proceeds to the discussion of the relations between "Rome and the Orient." This constitutes the material of the first chapter. Rome turned to the Orient for industrial goods and riches, for technical ability and artistic productions, as well as for intelligence and science. While Greece was on the decline, Egypt, Syria, Asia Minor, and Persia excelled in many respects both Italy and Greece. Thus Rome could not but take advantage and develop good relations with the Orient.

Cumont argues that the Orient was superior to Europe during the first three centuries B.C., not only in cultural manifestations but even in moral ascendancy. Due to this moral and spiritual superiority "the 'history of the Empire during the first three centuries may be summarized as a 'peaceful infiltration' of the Orient into the Occident." The author goes on to indicate the influence of the Orient upon the diverse institutions of Rome, such as the legal and political ones. An absolute monarchy, for example, whether theocratic or bureaucratic, was not of Greek or Roman origin. It was introduced into the Roman Empire from Egypt and Syria where it was the form of government.

In this chapter the author enumerates other contributions of the Orient to Rome. But though some of these contributions are called "Oriental," the author fails to describe them as Greek of the diaspora in origin. Thus the great astronomers, mathematicians, and physicians, such as Ptolemy and Plotinus, Porphyry and Iamblichus, Dioscorides and Galen, were not "Egyptians," "Syrians" or "Asiatics" as he describes them, but Greeks of Egypt, Syria or Asia. (Vide: Benjamin Farrington, *Greek Science*, Vol. 1, 2, Penguin Books, 1949). A man is the product not only of the land in which he was born, but of hereditary, social, cultural and educational factors as well.

It seems to me that one can question generalizations of this kind by the author. While he overemphasizes the influence of the Orient, he neglects to mention the role of the Greek element outside Greece proper upon Rome. Though he admits that the sources about the Oriental influence upon Rome are inadequate, the author concludes that "in no field of thought was its influence under the Empire, so decisive as in religion."

On such a basis the author proceeds to the second chapter in which he discusses "Why the Oriental Religions spread."

He states that it is difficult to determine why the Oriental influence was the strongest of all in the religious field. This would not be so if he regarded history as the result of economic and social forces only. But Cumont refuses to agree with the opinion of scholars who promote such an interpretation of history. Religion is always a great factor in the historical process.

It is certain that Syrian and other Oriental emigrants and merchants of the East were in constant communication with Rome and Italy. Ease of communication is an additional factor in the increase of influences upon Rome. Thus, the spread of Oriental religions was due to a combination of factors: the intrinsic strength of the Oriental religions, the eagerness of the merchants to act as missionaries, and the more advanced type of Oriental religious forms than those in Roman paganism.

The author attacks the prevalent conception in the West which claims that Asia was inferior to Europe under Rome. He argues that religious cults in Asia, though they assumed at times the appearance of savagery, were less primitive, less simple and more moral than Roman paganism. It is only on moral grounds that we can explain a great religious conquest, he argues.

The Oriental religions found a way to Rome because of their ability to satisfy the thirst for religious emotions which the austere and legalistic Roman creed had been unable to quench. Cumont presents here a second point as to why Oriental religions could also satisfy the intellect more fully than Roman paganism. He sums up these ideas as follows: "The Oriental mysteries . . . could stir the soul by arousing admiration and terror, pity and enthusiasm in turn. They gave the intellect the illusion of learned depth and absolute certainty and finally — our third point — they satisfied conscience as well as passion and reason." (pp. 34-35)

The author while describing the merits of the Oriental religions does not fail to present the poverty of Roman paganism. It was be-

cause of this poor condition of Roman religion that Oriental mysteries established themselves in Roman society. Roman paganism was poor in theology, and worship was more a civic duty than the expression of a personal belief. The author convincingly develops the thesis that the Oriental cults and mysteries acting "upon the senses, the intellect and the conscience at the same time" gained hold on the entire man.

But, in addition, Oriental creeds offered greater beauty of ritual and a far superior morality. The pomp and sensuality of their ceremonies and festivities appealed to the Romans, especially to the simple and the humble. These are the reasons why the Oriental religions spread in the Roman Empire.

Following the preceding rather compact and philosophical discussion, Cumont proceeds to the examination of the religious influence of such Oriental regions as Asia Minor, Egypt, Syria, and Persia. He devotes an additional chapter to the influence of Asiatic astrology and magic.

Asia Minor was the first to have its gods accepted by the Romans. The Great Mother Goddess of Ida, better known as Cybele (*Magna Mater deum idea*), was the first Oriental deity adopted by the Romans. The author describes how this goddess came to exert a great influence when the Romans faced enemies and evils. The worship of Ida was officially introduced in 205 when Hannibal threatened the Roman people. Cumont goes on to examine the inner beliefs of this religion. Together with the introduction of Cybele, another Oriental god was adopted known as Attis. Both these deities originated in Phrygia.

During the wars of the Romans against Mithridates, the Roman soldiers learned to revere and worship Ma, a goddess of the peoples around the Taurus mountains. The worship of Isis did not find prompt followers but after a long resistance, she, too, was introduced officially in the Roman pantheon. The author in his presentation of these deities presents also their theological and moral principles which to a great measure were responsible for their headway in Roman society, such as promise of immortality, and attributes of God (i.e. "Hypsistos," "Almighty"), etc.

Of course, this Asiatic religion was not a stagnant creed but went through a progressive evolution which the author clearly points out.

The worship of Isis and Serapis was introduced from Egypt. These two deities found such an acceptance by the Romans, that they were worshipped in the Roman world for more than five centuries. Cumont

does not discuss the transformation of this cult during the period of five centuries, but he does point out its great influence in Roman society. He points out the virtues of this Egyptian religion which was responsible for its irresistible influence over the Romans. It was its extreme flexibility and adaptability and its eschatological doctrine about death and life.

Atargatis, not to be mistaken for the Phoenician Astarte, was the first Syrian divinity to enter the Italian peninsula. She was worshipped with her husband Hadad. These deities found their way to Rome by the slaves who were their first worshippers. From Syria to Delos, the slave market, to the Roman nobility. But Syrian colonies in Italy, too, contributed a great deal, together with the Semitic merchants who established chapels wherever they went in which they practiced the exotic rites of the Syrian gods.

But why the zeal of Romans to replace their ancient paganism, for example the Capitoline Jupiter by a Syrian god? Why such a man as Aurelian sought the fall of the old Latin paganism and the accession of a Syrian idolatry? Cumont says "that is the problem to be solved . . . that question has not as yet been very completely elucidated" (p. 115). Zoolatry, litholatry and all the other nature worship were introduced to the Latin world from Syria. Finally, solar pantheism, which imposed itself upon the Roman Empire, grew up along the Syrians of the Hellenistic period (p. 139).

The Romans, like the Greeks before them, found the Persians a dominant power in Asia. The Persians had displayed political and military strength which came to be respected by the Romans. Cumont discusses in detail how several institutions of Iranism were transmitted to the Roman Empire. For example, "the custom of carrying the sacred fire before the Caesars as an emblem of the perpetuity of their power, dated back to Darius and with other Persian traditions passed on to the dynasties that divided the empire of Alexander" (p. 137). Persian influence upon the Roman Empire can be attributed to various factors, such as the Persian dispersion. "Communities of magi were established not only in Eastern Asia Minor, but in Galatia, Phrygia, Lydia and even in Egypt. Everywhere they remained attached to their customs and beliefs with persistent tenacity. When Rome extended her conquests into Asia Minor and Mesopotamia, the influence of Persia became much more direct" (p. 139).

In addition to the influence of Persia upon Rome in the religious sphere, Cumont examines Persia's influence upon Roman political institutions and artistic tastes as well as on their ideas and beliefs. All these

became means by which the religion of Mithra became dominant in Italy. It was through Mithraism that the Romans were introduced to dualism. Roman paganism received from Mithraism a rigor and firmness unknown in its history. The author discusses thoroughly the problem of the origin of Mithra. The ancient authors tell us very little about its origin. Plutarch and Lactantius Placidus only fix its origin in Asia Minor. Despite its very origin all ancient authors agree that Mithra was a Persian god who passed "from the Persians to the Phrygians and from the Phrygians to the Romans" (p. 143).

Cumont is excellent in his treatment of Mithraism and its influence on the various phases of Roman life. Not outside of the Persian sphere of influence comes "Astrology and Magic." Cumont treats this topic comprehensibly, pointing out the service of astrology and the influence of magic in the Roman political and social life. Astrology came to be considered in Rome not only a science but also an art (p. 168).

The author, as in the previous chapters, discusses the reasons which inspired the precepts of astrology which lead to the conclusion that astrology "was religious in its origin and its principles" (p. 174). Principles of astrology, such as fatalism, are pointed out quite clearly.

Like astrology, magic was religious in character and in some respect, was considered a science. Both astrology and magic which infiltrated into Roman religion originated and were brought up together in Oriental temples. Cumont points out that the reaction of the Roman government was at times very austere toward certain practices of the astrologers and the magicians; nevertheless, with the invasion of the Oriental religions, magic and astrology began to receive more and more consideration.

The conclusion of the author is that despite their aberrations, "astrology and magic were not entirely fruitless. Their counterfeit learning has been a genuine help to the progress of human knowledge. Because they awakened chimerical hopes and fallacies of ambitions in the minds of their adepts, researches were undertaken which would never have been started or persisted in for the sake of a disinterested love of truth" (p. 195).

The last chapter of this compact and penetrating volume constitutes a resumé of Oriental religious contributions to Roman paganism. About the time of the Severi the Roman Empire presented an aspect of religious variety. Beside the Roman gods stood the pantheon of Asiatic origin. New powers had arrived from Asia Minor, Egypt, Syria, Persia

and the Orient in general, which exercised a decisive influence on the transformation of Roman paganism. Yet, all these native and foreign cults and beliefs contributed greatly "to the religious chaos in which the ancient world was struggling before the reign of Constantine" (p. 197).

Cumont reminds us once again that "when the atrophied parts of the Roman religion had been removed foreign elements had combined to give it a new vigor" (p. 202). But this syncretism could not survive as a religion for there was no continuity of tradition and of theological thought and moral principles. It did however prepare "all nations to unite in the bosom of a universal church" (p. 211). Such is the conclusion of this massive and scholarly work.

For the student of the Christian religion, this book is an excellent introduction to the religious climate and atmosphere in which Christianity was born. For the student of Roman history or Graeco-Roman civilization, it is a sure guide to the understanding of moral and religious conditions in the Eastern Mediterranean. Indeed a profound and provocative work.

THE REV. DEMETRIOS J. CONSTANTELOS

BRUCE M. METZGER, *An Introduction to the Apocrypha*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1957. Pp. xii, 274.

For the Greek Orthodox reader the title of this book is misleading. It is not an introduction to the apocrypha and pseudepigrapha according to the Greek Orthodox terminology, but to the books of the Old Testament known in the Church as Deuterocanonical or Ἀβαγινωσκόμενα. As such the present volume is of great importance to the Orthodox Christian. This literature is of great historical value, not to mention the ethical and educational, for it throws much light on the period beginning around 400 B.C. down to the birth of Christianity.

Professor Metzger, a distinguished Biblical and historical scholar at Princeton Theological Seminary, presents a very comprehensive and scholarly analysis of the books that comprise this Biblical literature. This work was based on the text included in the Revised Standard edition of the Bible published in 1957.



Copyright and Use:

As an ATLAS user, you may print, download, or send articles for individual use according to fair use as defined by U.S. and international copyright law and as otherwise authorized under your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement.

No content may be copied or emailed to multiple sites or publicly posted without the copyright holder(s)' express written permission. Any use, decompiling, reproduction, or distribution of this journal in excess of fair use provisions may be a violation of copyright law.

This journal is made available to you through the ATLAS collection with permission from the copyright holder(s). The copyright holder for an entire issue of a journal typically is the journal owner, who also may own the copyright in each article. However, for certain articles, the author of the article may maintain the copyright in the article. Please contact the copyright holder(s) to request permission to use an article or specific work for any use not covered by the fair use provisions of the copyright laws or covered by your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement. For information regarding the copyright holder(s), please refer to the copyright information in the journal, if available, or contact ATLA to request contact information for the copyright holder(s).

About ATLAS:

The ATLA Serials (ATLAS®) collection contains electronic versions of previously published religion and theology journals reproduced with permission. The ATLAS collection is owned and managed by the American Theological Library Association (ATLA) and received initial funding from Lilly Endowment Inc.

The design and final form of this electronic document is the property of the American Theological Library Association.

ORTHODOXY AND ANGLICANISM IN THE TWENTIETH CENTURY*

By VASIL T. ISTAVRIDIS

The topic which I have chosen to study in this paper is Orthodoxy and Anglicanism in the XXth century. Before proceeding to the main theme a few things should be said about relations between the two during the previous centuries. The concluding point will be the IXth Lambeth Conference of 1958. I have followed the plan of presenting the main historical facts in a chronological order and explaining them by the views of other Greek Orthodox theologians. So this paper, apart from the factual historical material, gives an idea of what the Greek Orthodox Church and Orthodox theology think of contacts between Orthodoxy and Anglicanism.

Little is known about the spread of Christianity in England. The Christian Church there was formed under the influence of Celtic and Roman Christianity. Early traditions speak of influences from the Greek Christian East as well. Prof. Alivisatos sees in those centuries three main characteristics which more or less still exist in the Church of England: (a) The Church was and still is closely related to the nation, thus being a national Church; (b) the Anglican Church proved to be an exceptionally missionary Church; and (c) the Church of England was and still is chiefly an island Church.¹ During Henry VIII's reign (1509-1547) the Church of England stopped being an integral part of Roman Catholicism and became an independent Church. Throughout the following centuries the Anglican Church developed a particular type of ecclesiastical faith and order and through its missionary work has spread all over the world. Today, the Churches connected with the See of Canterbury form the worldwide Anglican Communion. Orthodoxy, on the other hand, consists of the Patriarchates and the Autocephalous or National Churches united by the same faith to the Ecumenical See of Constantinople.

* Paper presented at The Ecumenical Institute (Bossey, near Celigny, Switzerland) Church Historians Conference, August 28 to September 1, 1959.

¹ *To kyros tes Ierosynes tes Anglikanikes Ekklesias* (Athens, 1940) pp. 20-21.

Strictly speaking, contacts between the two Churches began after the Reformation period (XVIth c.). With the passage of time they have taken many forms and developed for the better. In the first centuries there were no relations of a geographical or political nature. Relations were mostly friendly but scientific and academic in nature. A shadow falls upon them by the proselytism of the XVIIIth and the first half of the XIXth centuries, which fortunately stopped later on. Up to the beginning of our century those relations were still friendly and on an academic level.

In the XVIIth century, an exchange of letters began between the Archbishop of Canterbury and the hierarchs in the East. Well known is the correspondence of Cyril Lukaris, Patriarch of Alexandria (1601-20) and of Constantinople (1620-38) with Archbishop Abbott (1611-33) who was the first in the See of Canterbury to write to an Orthodox Patriarch. Lukaris established wider contacts with other ecclesiastical and political authorities of England. He sent there Metropophanes Critopoulos (1617) who until 1624 stayed in that country studying at Oxford and getting in touch with several personalities. At the end of the XVIIth century a short-lived Greek college (1699-1705) was founded in Oxford by Dr. B. Woodroffe in order to educate needy Greek children from the East. The late Church Historian Ph. Bapheidis and Prof. J. Karmiris say that this college was also established for religious purposes.² The cause of better acquaintance was successfully served and promoted by the British Embassy in Istanbul and the other diplomatic and commercial delegations, through the chaplains and the visitors to the East, and the publishing houses in England, such as the S.P.C.K. (1698) and others founded in the years to come. Within the above category falls the work of J. Basire, an Anglican traveller to the East, Paul Rycaut (1628-1700) serving the Levant Company as consul in Smyrna (1667-79), John Covel (1638-1722) chaplain in the Embassy of Istanbul (1669-79) and others famous by their writings.

In the XVIIIth century, the contacts of the Nonjurors with the Eastern Patriarchs and Peter the Great of Russia form the most significant event in the history of the subject we are dealing with. From the ensuing correspondence (1716-24) a great degree of agreement was reached. The Nonjurors seem to have accepted the Holy Scriptures and Tradition (not entirely in the same broad meaning); the in-

² Ph. Bapheidis, *Ekklesiastike Historia*, IIIB (Alexandria, 1928) 103-4. J. N. Karmiris, *Orthodoxia kai Protestantismos* (Athens, 1937) I, 318.

fallibility of the Church, when she pronounces synodically the truth under the Lordship of Christ; the independence of the Church from the state; all sacraments and the communion under both elements, and the particular judgment. They rejected the teaching of Purgatory. They had some hesitancy on the honour due to the Theotokos, the Saints, the Icons and the teaching on *metousiosis*, preferring to use the term *metavole* instead. The Orthodox were willing to accept a degree of freedom for the customs of each particular Church but insisted on the meaning of unity as a return to and acceptance of the dogmas of the ancient undivided Church of the Ecumenical Synods. The validity of Anglican Ordinations was not discussed, which according to the late Church Historian Chr. Papadopoulos and G. Florovsky, means that the Nonjuring bishops were accepted as canonically ordained by the Orthodox.³ The importance of the present intercourse is rightly highly credited by Prof. Karmiris. Though the Nonjurors were a schismatic group within their Church, their stand shows the degree to which the unity-loving Anglicans may yield. To the Orthodox this was significant because the Patriarchs were stating the true ecclesiological teaching on Orthodox unity.⁴ Archimandrite J. Kotsonis says that no problem of intercommunion between Orthodox and Protestants appears here for the first time in history.⁵

With the stopping of proselytism in the second half of the XIXth century, the rapprochement between the two Churches will be animated again. The formal or informal visits of hierarchs and other clergymen and theologians, the Conferences of Lambeth and Bonn, the special Committees for unity, the beginning of regular correspondence, the immigration of Orthodox peoples to the West and the formation of Anglican communities within the jurisdiction of Orthodox Churches, the political factor and the efforts on the part of Anglicans to practise intercommunion are of great importance.

All Orthodox who have studied the Oxford Movement (1833-45) stress the influence exerted by it upon the Church of England for the new establishment of friendly relations with the Orthodox. To this

³ Chr. Papadopoulos, *To zetema peri tou kyrou ton Anglikanikon Cheirotonion* (Jerusalem, 1925) p. 25. English translation by J. A. Gouglas (London: Faith Press, 1931). G. Florovsky, in R. Rouse, *A History of the Ecumenical Movement* (London: SPCK, 1954) p. 193.

⁴ *Op. cit.*, p. c28. *Idem, Dogmatica et Symbolica Monumenta Orthodoxae Catholicae Ecclesiae*, 2 vols. (Athens, 1952-3) II, 787-8.

⁵ *Intercommunio* (Athens, 1957) pp. 13-14.

movement belongs Deacon W. Palmer (1811-79) who, while remaining an Anglican, asked to participate in the sacraments of the Orthodox Church of Russia and the Ecumenical Patriarchate, and J. Mason Neale (1818-66), the famous author of books on Orthodox Church History and Hymnology. The foundation of Anglican bishoprics in Jerusalem (1881, 1886, 1957) and of Gibraltar (1842) was of importance. Committees for the study of Orthodoxy on permanent bases from the Anglican side were the Russo-Greek Committee (1862) in the Protestant Episcopal Church of America, and the Eastern Church Association (1863) in England. Others were formed in the XXth century: the Anglican and Eastern Churches Union (1906) and the Anglican and Eastern Churches Association in 1914 as a fusion of the last two. The latter still exists.

In 1869 as a result of the correspondence between the Archbishop A. Campbell Tait and the Ecumenical Patriarch Gregory VI came the decision of the second, according to which Anglicans dying in the East could, by a special ecclesiastical service, be buried by Orthodox priests. This action was taken in the light of Orthodox Economy and is the first step to intercommunion. At the end of the same year the Archbishop of Syros and Tenos, Al. Lykourgos, while in England, was present at a theological conference with Anglicans which aimed at finding and classifying the existing differences. In the same period, we see, especially among some converts to Orthodoxy, some tendencies for creating a Western type of Orthodoxy. The names of S. Heatherly, V. Guetée, and J. J. Overbeck are connected with this trend.

The Bonn Conferences of 1874 and 1875 between Old Catholics, Orthodox and Anglicans bear an ecclesiastical and theological character and as such are the beginning and set the type of the later official or unofficial ecclesiastical and theological discussions. In those Conferences, Anglicans and Orthodox came closer to each other. Anglicans seemed to accept Holy Tradition as contained in the Ecumenical Symbols of Faith and in the dogmatic decisions of the ancient undivided Church, the uncanonical addition of Filioque to the Creed, but not its removal from it, the teaching of St. John of Damascus, that "the Holy Ghost issues out of the Father through the Son," the sacrament of Repentance, the remission of ecclesiastical penalties, the sacrificial character of the Holy Eucharist and the memorial services.

The Lambeth Conferences, which have no binding authority but declare the general opinion in the Anglican Communion, deal from the 3rd Conference on (1888) with Orthodox-Anglican relations. This

subject was being studied unilaterally from the Anglican side until the 5th Conference (1908). With the coming of Orthodox delegations during the time of these Conferences from the 6th in 1920 and on, this procedure becomes bilateral. The third Lambeth Conference (1888) notes some difficulties with some Orthodox practices, bars the practice of proselytism and "desires to express its hope that the barriers to fuller communion may be, in the course of time, removed by further intercourse and extended enlightenment."⁶ The 4th Lambeth Conference (1897) shows the existing ignorance on either side as regards the position of the other, the differences between the two Churches mostly based on thought, temperament, and language, and accepts the resolution (36) "that the Archbishops of Canterbury and York and the Bishop of London be requested to act as a Committee with power to add to their number . . ." on Orthodox matters.⁷

In 1898, Bishop John Wordsworth of Salisbury visited the Ecumenical Patriarchate and the East. The next year (1899) Archbishop Fr. Temple and the Ecumenical Patriarch Constantine V started a regular correspondence which still continues in our own days. Constantine V organized in the Patriarchate (1899) a special Committee which decided to ask for a report on the teaching of the Anglican Church on certain points. This report was written by the Bishop of Salisbury and according to Fr. Florovsky "was a semi-official statement."⁸

In the XIXth century, the names of Philaret (1782–1867), Russian theologian and hierarch, and Al. Khomyakov (1804–60), a Russian layman, should be mentioned. In the nineties, we have an exchange of visits and a dialogue among representatives of the Russian Orthodox and Anglican Churches. In this field belong the visits to Russia of J. W. Birbeck (1859–1917). The question of Anglican Orders, after their condemnation by the Pope (1896), spurred the interest of Orthodox theologians. The Russian Orthodox theologians B. A. Socolov and Ath. Bulgakov were the first from the Orthodox side to study them from a scientific point of view. Both of them, while having hesitations on the dogmatic side, were ready to give a favorable answer on them.

Bapheidis summing up his impressions about the existing relations to the end of the XIXth century says:

⁶ Archbishop D. Davidson, ed., *The Six Lambeth Conferences, 1867-1920*, reissue (London: SPCK, 1929).

⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 244-6, 205-6.

⁸ *Op. cit.*, p. 211.

"Although the relations of this period between the two Churches had no substantial results, they were of great benefit in explaining the dogmatic differences existing between the two, the elimination of which is not a matter of time, since they are related to the spirit, which rules them both. A number of Greek and English theologians have optimistically declared the possibility of union of the two Churches, but as long as the Protestant mentality dominates the Anglican Church, as long as the Church itself lacks unity, firmness, and precise ecclesiastical awareness, while it suffers from dogmatic laxness and is pressed by the State, this union does not seem to be so easy to accomplish in the near future."⁹

Orthodox and Anglican contacts during the XXth century may be studied in three successive periods:

1. From the beginning of the century to World War I (1901–14).
2. From World War I to 1930.
3. From 1930 to 1958.

1. The Ecumenical Patriarch Joachim III (1901–12) with his Encyclical letter to the Heads of the Sister Orthodox Churches started an official correspondence (1902–4) in which the relations of Orthodoxy and Anglicanism were favorably looked upon. The Ecumenical Patriarch in 1907 appointed as his official representative to the Archbishop of Canterbury the Archimandrite C. Pagonis, which action according to Kotsonis means "the indirect recognition not only of the validity of Orders of the Heterodox, but of their Church also."¹⁰ In 1907 the first Anglican student entered the Theological School of Halki in Istanbul. The exchange of students continues to the present.

In the first years of the present century, the scientific discussion of the problem of the validity of Anglican Orders begins within Greek-speaking Orthodox theology. Chr. Androutsos, then Professor at Halki, was the first to write such a treatise (1903), in which this whole matter was studied from the dogmatic side. According to him, the problem cannot be studied in principle or generally but only in the case of the reception of individual Anglican clerics into the bosom of Orthodoxy. After a confession of faith made by the Anglican Church (High Church) he was willing to accept the validity of the Orders.¹¹ This

⁹ *Op. cit.*, pp. 123–4.

¹⁰ *Op. cit.*, p. 194.

¹¹ *To kyros ton Anglikanikon Cheirotonion ex epopeos Orthodoxou* (Constantinople, 1903). English translation by F. W. Groves Campbell (London, 1909).

book exerted a great influence upon the future discussion of this question within the Greek Orthodox circles. N. Amvrazis was ready to give a favorable answer but J. Mesoloras and K. Dyovouniotis stood on the opposite side. The Patriarch of Jerusalem Damian (1897-1931) in an answer to the Anglican Bishop in Jerusalem (1906-7) stated that this problem could be solved by the whole Orthodox Church. In the Orthodox Church of Russia the views of Sokolov and Bulgakov were opposed by S. Tsistakov, J. Sokolov, B. A. Kerensky and A. Rozdentshevsky. In this respect the correspondence (1903-5) of Bishop of Fond du Lac, Ch. Gratfon, with Metropolitan Antonii of St. Petersburg should be mentioned. This was a semi-official contact of the Protestant Episcopal Church in America with the Holy Synod of the Orthodox Church of Russia. In 1904 the Russian Archbishop Tikhon of North America asked his Holy Synod in which way he should accept to Orthodoxy Anglican clerics. A special commission appointed by the Holy Synod in its report was of the opinion "to offer to those who join a new conditional ordination."¹² In 1912 a Russian society of the Friends of the Anglican Church was inaugurated in St. Petersburg.

The continuous stream of Orthodox immigrants coming to the West and the inability of their mother Church to feed their spiritual needs and organize them properly right away gave to the Churches of the Anglican Communion the impetus, out of brotherly love, to serve these Orthodox in the Diaspora and have even acts of intercommunion, without the official recognition of the Orthodox Churches. The fifth Lambeth Conference of 1908 resolved (62) to admit members of Orthodox Churches into intercommunion and requested (61) the Archbishop of Canterbury to appoint a Committee on Orthodox affairs on a permanent basis.¹³ The only example of an Orthodox prelate urging his faithful to take part in the sacraments of the Anglican Churches was Bishop Raphael of Brooklyn of the Greek Orthodox Patriarchate of Antioch who did so by his Encyclical of 1910. Later he was forced to repeal this decision.

In this first period we meet on the Anglican side a fervent wish for a prompt realization of intercommunion. Although members of the Orthodox Churches were attending Anglican Churches and even participating in their sacraments, these acts did not have the official

¹² G. Florovsky, *op. cit.*, p. 212; W. Schneirla, "The Latest Orthodox-Anglican Conference: Moscow, 1956," *St. Vladimir's Seminary Quarterly*, n.s., (1957) 8-11. Chr. Papadopoulos, *op. cit.*, p. 45.

¹³ *The Six Lambeth Conferences*, p. 332.

recognition of their Church, because, according to Orthodox ecclesiology, intercommunion would be impossible without the union of Churches in the same faith. Contacts bear an academic and theoretical character and a great degree of ignorance still exists. The fact that Orthodox theologians have started to study the problem of Anglican Orders shows how much this means to the Orthodox.

2. The First World War (1914-18) starts a new era in the field of Orthodox and Anglican relations. This is due to the spirit of brotherly love and assistance shown by the Anglicans to the needy Orthodox Churches of the East and the presence of armies from England in the Balkans. This tendency to eliminate human sorrow will help future endeavors immensely. The ideals and work of great personalities on both sides contribute greatly to the work. Relations dating back to the end of the war are not merely theoretical but mainly ecclesiastical and have a rather scientific character. The interest does not come from Anglicans only but is mutual.

The help given by Anglicans to the Serbian Orthodox Church in assisting the education of its future priests and theologians in England and the U.S.A. is a good example of Christian love. In a conference of Russian Orthodox under the chairmanship of Evdokim, Archbishop of America, and Episcopalians in 1916 in the U.S.A., the subjects of the validity of Anglican Orders, the Apostolic Canons, Baptism, Fasting, and the VIIth Ecumenical Council were dealt with. The last official voice of the Russian Orthodox Church was heard by the Great Russian Sobor (1917-18) in its decision of September 20, 1918, in which favorable comments on the Anglican Church were made and the formation of a special Committee was decided upon. From 1918 on, the Russians of the Diaspora were mainly interested in this field. Alongside personal and other attempts, the Institute of St. Sergius (1925) and the Anglo-Russian Association of St. Alban and St. Sergius (1928) should be mentioned.

Among Orthodox hierarchs the man who fully served the work of furthering the cause of unity between the two Churches is Meletius Metaxakis (1871-1935). He, as Metropolitan of Athens (1918-20), with Chr. Papadoulos and H. Alivisatos had unofficial theological discussions with Episcopalians in America and Anglicans in England (1918) in which most of the familiar theological subjects such as the validity of Anglican Orders, the 39 Articles, the Filioque clause, the Ecumenical Synods, the sacraments in general and particularly Baptism, Chrism and the Seventh Ecumenical Council were included.

In order to recognize the validity of Anglican Ordinations the Orthodox delegates asked the Anglicans to accept: (a) Ordination as a sacrament; (b) the 39 Articles not as a symbolic statement; and (c) the Ecumenical Councils as infallible sources of the truth. Anglicans accepted in principle those teachings and stated that they accept ordination as a sacrament in the spirit of the Book of Common Prayer, the 39 Articles not as a dogmatic but as a historical statement, and the Ecumenical Councils in the same spirit as the Orthodox. They are willing to accept all sacraments, but divide them into two different groups. The Orthodox stated that they accept the validity of Anglican Baptism. The general opinion of the Orthodox delegates after these meetings was that the unity of the two Churches might become a reality in the future after steady and diligent preparation in the spirit of Christian love.¹⁴ Professor Alivisatos believed that all future discussions on the same subjects were based upon those.¹⁵ At the same time a conference of Anglicans and representatives of Rumanian and Serbian Orthodox Churches was held in Paris in which the topics of Baptism, Chrism (Confirmation), Holy Orders, Intercommunion, Holy Matrimony and the Burial Services were discussed.

An archimandrite named D. Maravelis, writing to the Bishop of Queensland in Australia (1919), speaks of an Encyclical he received from the Holy Synod of the Church of Greece authorizing him to allow the Orthodox in Australia to participate in the Anglican sacraments. Professor Alivisatos and J. Kotsonis¹⁶ were not able to find this document in the archives of the Holy Synod and think that it was a forgery.

In 1919 a delegation of Episcopalians visiting the Ecumenical Patriarchate and the other Churches in the East invited them to send representatives to the Preliminary Meeting of the W.C.F.O. meeting on August 12-20, 1920, in Geneva. The reply of the Orthodox Churches was favorable. Thus the Orthodox Churches were starting to participate in the Ecumenical Movement within which the cooperation of Orthodox and Anglicans on many occasions was a happy one. The following year (1920) the Ecumenical Patriarchate sent its Encyclical to all the Churches of Christ suggesting that contact, understanding and a League of Churches be established and promoted, which would

¹⁴ "Orthodoxon kai Anglicanon Theologikai Syzeteseis," *Kaine Didache* 2 (1920) 40-6.

¹⁵ *Op. cit.*, p. 96.

¹⁶ H. Alivisatos, *E Oekonomia kata to Kanonikon Dikaion tes Orthodoxou Ekklesias* (Athens, 1949) p. 56; J. Kotsonis, *op. cit.*, p. 38 fn. 45.

present a practical program. Many points from this document were already being practised in the Orthodox-Anglican relations. According to Professor Alivisatos, this Encyclical was favorably accepted by the Anglican Church.¹⁷ In 1920, for the first time in history, the Ecumenical Patriarchate sent a delegation to the Sixth Lambeth Conference, consisting of the famous Church Historian Ph. Bapheidis, then Metropolitan of Demotica, Professor P. Komninos of Halki and the Presbyters K. Pagonis and K. Callinicos. This delegation had official discussions with representatives of the Anglican Communion. Several topics were included again in the agenda. The Orthodox recognized the validity of Anglican Baptism, asked the Anglicans to accept the sacrificial character of the Holy Eucharist and the use of the Epiclesis, to which the Anglicans responded favorably. The Orthodox instead of the word *metousiosis* were willing to use the term *metarallesthai*, *metapoieisthai*. The subject of intercommunion was once more of crucial importance for the Anglicans. The Orthodox restated the teaching of their Church. The late Germanos of Thyateira says that "the wish for unity takes in this Conference of more concrete form."¹⁸

A document entitled "Terms of Intercommunion suggested between the Church of England and the Churches in Communion with her and the Eastern Orthodox Church" was produced in 1921 from the Church of England. Upon this future discussions were mainly based. The terms, 13 in number, from the Anglican side gave answers to the questions raised by the Orthodox and showed the degree of theological unity between the two Churches and the progress made so far. They expounded the teaching on the Christian Faith, Holy Scriptures, Creeds, Holy Spirit and Filioque, variety of customs in the Churches, number of sacraments, Holy Eucharist, Holy Orders and the Icons. Professor Karmiris thinks that "in those terms the Anglicans made enough recognitions and came closer to the Orthodox teaching but were with a Protestant mind discussing the Holy Scriptures and the Sacraments, while other items were not considered sufficiently."¹⁹

The Locum Tenens of the Patriarchate of Constantinople, Dorotheus of Broussa, paid a visit to Archbishop Randall Davidson in England (1921) in order to express the feelings of his Church to the Church of England. He offered to Davidson an enkolpion made for Patriarch Joachim III. His death took place suddenly during this visit. He was

¹⁷ *To kyros tes Ierosynes tes Anglikanikes Ekklesias*, p. 96.

¹⁸ "E Prosengisis Anglikanon kai Orthodoxon," *Orthodoxia* 9 (1934) 299.

¹⁹ *Orthodoxia kai Protestantismos*, I, 354.

the first occupant of the Patriarchal See of Constantinople to come to the West since Patriarch Joseph II attended the Council of Florence (1438) when the highest ranking Orthodox prelate came to the West. The same year Professor Komninos of Halki published his book on Anglican Ordinations in which this problem was dealt with from a new angle. The Orthodox Church, according to him, ought to consider the Anglican Orders as having the same value as those of the Roman Catholic and the Armenian clergy. He was of the opinion that the Anglican Church gives secondary importance to the 39 Articles and performs the sacraments of Holy Eucharist and Holy Orders like the Orthodox, according to the teaching of the Book of Common Prayer. He was for mutual intercommunion in cases of emergency and the possibility for an Orthodox Church to take a decision without the concurrence of other Autocephalous Churches. Several professors from Athens University: Dyovouniotis, Alivisatos, Balanos, Bratsiotis, think that this book was written without a deep and critical knowledge of the subject. But all of them, including Chr. Papadopoulos, admit the influence which this book exerted upon the decision of the Ecumenical Patriarchate for the recognition of Anglican Orders taken in 1922 during the patriarchate of Meletios IV (Metaxakis). Meletios announcing this decision to the Archbishop of Canterbury said "that there is as yet no matter here of a decree by the whole Orthodox Church." Professor Bratsiotis who is very critical of the actions of Meletios Metaxakis considers this decision "a very daring act" and taken "without any condition and economy."²⁰ The late Gennadios of Heliopolis says that contrary to the opinion of Androutsos this decision was taken in principle.²¹ But I think that the Ecumenical Patriarchate by its decision was staying within the boundaries of Orthodox theology. This recognition was not exerted absolutely or in principle, but "in the case of the union of the two Churches," as the Encyclical of Meletios to the Presidents of the Orthodox Churches (1922) states. Of the same opinion are the late Chr. Papadopoulos and J. Kotsonis.²² Professor Karmiris attaches to it a "simply preparatory character."²³ In 1923 the Churches of Jerusalem and Cyprus followed the Ecumeni-

²⁰ *Orthodoxoi kai Anglikanoi, 1918-1931* (Athens, 1931) p. 5; *Ai Anglikanikai Cheirotoniai, ex epopseos Orthodoxou* (Athens, 1939) p. 17. See also W. Schneirla, *op. cit.*, p. 20.

²¹ "To kyros ton Anglikanikon Cheirotonion," *Orthodoxia* 13 (1938) 127.

²² Papadopoulos, *op. cit.*, p. 70; Kotsonis, *Peri tou kyrou tes Ierosynes ton Anglikanon* (Athens, 1958) pp. 35-36. English translation in *The Greek Orthodox Theological Review*, III (1957) 182-196. IV (1958) 44-65.

²³ *Dogmatica et Symbolica Monumenta*, II, 1029.

cal Patriarchate. Patriarch Meletios IV founded in 1922 the Metropolis (from 1954 Archbishopric) of Thyateira as the Greek Orthodox Exarchate of Western and Central Europe with the See in London. The holder of this position was and is the Apokrisarios of the Patriarch to the Archbishop of Canterbury. First Metropolitan of Thyateira was Germanos Strenopoulos (1922-51), who not only as an ecclesiastical statesman, but also as a theologian, accomplished the most. Meletios received also a statement of Faith of a Committee of the English Church Union, signed by prominent Anglo-Catholics (among them the Bishop Charles Gore of Oxford), consisting of ten points and sounding in several parts quite Orthodox. According to Chr. Papadopoulos, "that statement . . . fulfils all the conditions required by Orthodox theologians for the economic recognition of the validity of Anglican Ordinations."²⁴

Representatives of the Orthodox Churches: Germanos of Thyateira from the Ecumenical Patriarchate, Photius of Alexandria from the Patriarchates of Alexandria and Antioch, Damian of Jerusalem for his Church and representatives of the Churches of Rumania and Greece and two Russian Metropolitans, were present in London during the commemoration of the 1600th anniversary of the First Ecumenical Council in Nicea (325/1925). The Orthodox visitors participated in the religious services at Westminster Abbey. Photius recited the Nicene-Constantinopolitan Creed, without the addition of the Filioque. In the theological discussions the themes of unity, the mutual interchange of clergymen of the two Churches in the services for the departed, Baptism and Marriage were discussed. Kotsonis finds the act of Photius and the rest of the Orthodox delegates, in wearing their liturgical vestments, as an example of Intercommunion."²⁵ The Orthodox delegates to the first W.C.F.O. at Lausanne (1927) read their statement which for its contents is of particular relevance to the Orthodox-Anglican contacts. "Where the totality of the faith is absent there can be no communion *in sacris*." "Reunion can take place only on the basis of the common faith and confession of the ancient, undivided Church of the seven Oecumenical Councils and of the first eight centuries."²⁶ All later Orthodox statements in the conferences of the Ecumenical Movement are of the same value.

²⁴ *Op. cit.*, p. 58.

²⁵ *Intercommunio*, pp. 41-3; Karmiris, *Orthodoxia kai Protestantismos*, I, 357.

²⁶ H. N. Bates ed., *Faith and Order* (Lausanne, 1927; Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday, Doran & Co., Inc., 1928) pp. 382-6.

Finally, after two years (1929), the Archbishop of Canterbury, Cosmo G. Lang, visited Athens, where he was very well received by the Church of Greece.

3. Relations begun in 1930 and continued bring us to their final phase. Almost all later efforts have some common characteristics. They are a continuation of the Orthodox-Anglican theological discussions in Lambeth of 1930 and 1931. In these two Conferences the degree of agreement reached on both sides was admirable. Anglicans stressed once more there the need for economic intercommunion, while Orthodox wanted first the unity in faith, showing nevertheless some degree of elasticity. In the following years, as the Orthodox Churches of the Diaspora became better organized, they were called upon to inform the Heterodox and to witness to the essence and dogmatical structure of the Church; Orthodox theology developed and the subject of Orthodox-Anglican contacts and the Ecumenical Movement in general was studied more critically and with ampler experience. During the Second World War (1939-45) the two Churches passed through the same experiences, as in the former World War. The voice of the Orthodox Church of Russia was heard once more in the inter-Christian world. This constituted a new historical factor. The question of the validity of Anglican Orders was not solved favorably by all Orthodox Churches, but passed through a period of wavering. Relations still bore their friendly and brotherly character.

The delegates of the Orthodox Churches who met on Mount Athos in June 1930 described the relations of Orthodox and Anglicans as based upon the spirit of love, which "hopeth all things," because Anglicans try to come closer to the Orthodox Churches and do not perform the act of proselytism.²⁷ After one month the Seventh Lambeth Conference was meeting in London. To this, after proper invitations were extended to the Orthodox Churches through the Ecumenical Patriarch Photius II (1929-36), an inclusive Orthodox Delegation, except from the Church of Russia, headed by the Patriarch of Alexandria Meletios II Metaxakis (1926-35), came to London and met with a special committee of the same Conference chaired by the Bishop of Gloucester A. Headlam. The Anglican members belonged to all schools of thought. The meeting at Lambeth, in the words of Photius, was "the first general contact between the whole Orthodox Church with the Church of England." At the end of this Conference came the Report and the Résumé of the discussion, July 15-18, 1930. The Résumé

²⁷ *Praktika tes Prokatarktikies Epitropes* (Constantinople, 1930) p. 144.

contains 17 articles. The appointment of a joint commission was agreed. The terms of Intercommunion (1921) according to the Anglicans "are not inconsistent with the mind and doctrine of the Anglican Church." To the Orthodox "they . . . would form a useful basis of discussion with certain modifications." Statements were made about the body which takes decisions in the questions of faith and deals with the Church discipline. Anglicans stated that in a sense ordination is a *mysterion*, as also their belief in apostolic succession, and the Eucharistic sacrifice. They then touched the subject of sacramental ministrations to Orthodox who are out of reach of their own Church's ministrations. Orthodox stated that they recognize the validity of Anglican Baptism and that the whole problem of intercommunion would be brought before the forthcoming Prosynod of their Church. Meanwhile the Orthodox delegation "is of opinion that the practice of the Orthodox receiving Holy Communion from Anglican priests in case of need and where no Orthodox priest was available, might continue, provided that on Orthodox authority did not prohibit such a practice."²⁸ The Lambeth Conference accepted the appointment of a joint Doctrinal Commission (33b) and recorded its acceptance of the Résumé "as a sufficient account of the teaching and practice of the Church of England and of the Churches in communion with it." (33c). In Lambeth the Anglicans explained several of their teachings in an Orthodox way with which the Orthodox were satisfied. The Orthodox delegation showed some signs of recognizing intercommunion. This led several Orthodox theologians to express their criticism. These are the Metropolitan of Leontopolis (present Patriarch of Alexandria) Christophoros and the Professors at Athens: Gr. Papamichael, K. Dyovouniotis, D. Balanos, H. Alivisatos, B. Stephanidis, P. Bratsiotis, J. Karmiris, and others.²⁹ The latest to write, J. Kotsonis, speaks in this way: "If from the Orthodox side the decisions had been put into practice, this would have meant an entire change of the canonical order so far held in the Church."³⁰ Professor Karmiris summing up the opinions of the Orthodox theologians, as of the Patriarch Meletios, Germanos of Thyateira, A. Rosmares, H. Alivisatos, on the importance of the Lambeth con-

²⁸ *Lambeth Occasional Reports, 1931-8* (London: SPCK, 1948) pp. 85-112.

²⁹ Christophoros of Leontopolis, "Ai en Lambeth tou 1930 Enotikai Prospatheiai Anglikanon kai Orthodoxon," *Ecclesia* 9 (1931) 202 fn. 1. P. Bratsiotis, *Orthodoxoi kai Anglikanoi*, pp. 44-5. Opinions of the rest, *ib.*, p. 45, fn. 1. J. N. Karmiris, *Orthodoxia kai Protestantismos*, I, 364, fn. 1. K. Dyovouniotis, *Peri tes Enoseos tes Anglikanikes Ekklesias meta tes Orthodoxou* (Athens, 1932). B. Stephanidis, *Ekklesiastike Historia* (Athens, 1948) p. 655.

³⁰ *Op. cit.*, p. 43.

versations, rightly says that these "marked a new important step in the road of rapprochement of the two Churches, Orthodox and Anglican."³¹

A result of the Lambeth Conversations was the recognition of the validity of Anglican Orders by the Patriarchate of Alexandria (1930) and the appointment by the Ecumenical Patriarch and the Archbishop of Canterbury of the Joint Doctrinal Commission. This met at Lambeth from the 15-20th October, 1931, having as chairmen Germanos of Thyateira and the Bishop of Gloucester, A. Headlam, and worked on the consultation of the points of agreement and difference between the Anglican and the Eastern Churches.³² On the Anglican side there was again a tendency to decide on the problem of intercommunion. Upon this Germanos of Thyateira right in the beginning made the following statement: "Sacramental communion will follow as the last step of the process when complete dogmatic agreement has been established and unity has taken place." This was said by both parties in the Conclusion: "We agree that the basis of Intercommunion should be a union of Faith." Discussions were based upon the first ten out of the thirteen terms of intercommunion. These ten were reduced to six: (1) The Christian Revelation; (2) Scripture and Tradition; (3) The Creed of the Church; (4) The Doctrine of the Holy Spirit; (5) Variety of customs and usages in the Church; and (6) The Sacraments. Agreement was reached on the divine Revelation and on its transmission through Scripture and Tradition, on the Canon of Scripture, the meaning of Deuterocanonical, called sometimes *Anaginoskomena*, on the Holy Tradition, on the Creed of the Catholic Church being the Nicene or sometimes called the Nicaeno-Constantinopolitan, on the doctrine of the Holy Spirit, recording the propositions at Bonn in 1875, on the customs in the Church being of two classes: (a) obligatory for the whole Church, and (b) of local character, and in the manner of celebrating the sacraments. Disagreement was recorded in the teaching on the number of sacraments, the Orthodox holding their teaching on seven sacraments and the Anglicans about the sacraments of Baptism and Holy Eucharist as being pre-eminent above the rest, though the other rites may in some sense be called sacraments. Germanos of Thyateira describes the work of this Commission as "one step in the promotion of the work of unity between the two Churches," and speaking about the conclusion on the final day says: "We do not regard it as the final conclusion. We regard it as a starting point for fresh exertions and fresh activities." Kotsonis notes that "the Orthodox Dele-

³¹ *Op. cit.*, p. 364.

³² *Lambeth Occasional Reports*, pp. 43-85.

tion returned to the canonical basis from the Orthodox point of view.”³³

The Conference of the Rumanian Orthodox and Anglican Commission held in Bucharest, June 1-8, 1935, constitutes a continuation of the 1930, 1931 meetings. In this, as stated in the conclusion of the Official Report,³⁴ agreements were reached upon the doctrine and significance of the Sacred Ministry, the Holy Eucharist, Holy Tradition and upon Justification. A preliminary agreement was also reached upon the nature and character as Holy Mysteries of the last five sacraments. The Rumanian Commission made a unanimous recommendation to the Holy Synod to accept the validity of Anglican Orders, which was done in 1936. According to both Commissions “this Conference has prepared a solid foundation for dogmatic agreement between the Orthodox and Anglican Churches.” The Convocation of Canterbury accepted and approved this Report (Jan. 1937) as being “consonant with Anglican formularies and a legitimate interpretation of the Faith of the Church as held by the Anglican Communion.” A year after the Conference (1936) the Patriarch of Rumania, Myron, paid a visit to England where he was well received. Professor Bratsiotis studying the attitude of Orthodox Churches in their dialogue with Anglicans from the end of the First World War until this period finds “a gradual decline of their dogmatic sensitiveness,” while Professor E. R. Hardy says that “the discussions of 1930-5 have at least illuminated the relation of Orthodox and Anglican theology over a wide area.”³⁵

The visit of the Archbishop Cosmo G. Lang to Athens and for the first time in history to the Ecumenical Patriarchate in Phanar is of great importance. This visit, according to the late P. Lialine, was “an unusual thing,” while, in the words of the late Gennadios of Heliopolis, “the natural outcome of the relations and discussions between the two Churches, started almost three centuries before.”³⁶

The Orthodox Church of Greece dealt with the problem of Anglican Ordinations in 1939. After the studies of Professors H. Alivisatos,

³³ *Op. cit.*, pp. 46-7.

³⁴ *Lambeth Occasional Reports*, pp. 189-205. G. K. A. Bell ed., *Documents on Christian Unity*, Third Series (1930-48) (London: Oxford Univ. Press, 1948) pp. 43-50.

³⁵ Bratsiotis, *Ai Anglikanikai Cheirotoniai*, p. 21; E. R. Hardy, *Orthodox Statements on Anglican Orders* (New York: Morehouse-Gorham Co., 1946) p. xxi.

³⁶ Dom Cl. Lialine, “Anglicanisme et Orthodoxie,” *Istina* 3 (1956) 37; Gennadios of Heliopolis, “Epi te eis to Oekoumenikon Patriarcheion Episkepse tou Kantaourias,” *Orthodoxia* 14 (1939) 103-8.

D. Balanos, P. Bratsiotis, the note of P. Trempelas and the report of the Faculty of Athens, the Holy Synod decreed a rather general statement on the way in individual cases she "recognizes by Economy the Ordination of those who come over to Orthodoxy."³⁷

An Anglican Commission headed by the Bishop of Gloucester visited in 1940 the Orthodox Churches of Bulgaria, Serbia and Greece, but those contacts brought no definite results. During the Second World War the Orthodox Church of Russia resumed once again her direct contacts with the Christian Churches outside of Russia. Thus, leaving aside the correspondence, we note an exchange of visits between Orthodox and Anglican prelates in the years 1943 and 1945. In the Conference of Moscow (1948) the Orthodox Church of Russia, in the presence of representatives from the Orthodox Churches behind the Iron Curtain and the Patriarchates of Alexandria and Antioch, took a negative decision on the validity of Anglican Ordinations. The acceptance by the representatives of the Churches of Alexandria and Rumania of this decision constitutes a reversal of their previous positive declarations.

In the meantime the Eighth Lambeth Conference was convened in London (1948) to which, from the Orthodox, a tiny delegation under the chairmanship of Germanos of Thyateira was present. The Orthodox had some unofficial discussions. This Lambeth Conference speaks about the favorable decisions made by some Orthodox Churches in the past about Anglican Ordinations as "provisional" in character. The calling of no Panorthodox Synod constitutes a major obstacle to the promotion of relations between the two Churches. The Conference in a Resolution (66a) "asks the Archbishop of Canterbury, in cooperation with the Ecumenical Patriarch, to appoint a further Joint Commission."³⁸ The ensuing correspondence between the Ecumenical Patriarch and the Archbishop of Canterbury for the realization of the above-mentioned resolution and for the contacts in general was continuous but conditions did not permit its fulfilment.

Russo-Anglican contacts followed a satisfactory course. In 1955 during the visit of a Christian delegation from Russia to England its chairman, the Metropolitan Pitirim, and the three other Orthodox members held one-day theological discussions with the Anglicans. Pitirim

³⁷ Bell, *op. cit.*, pp. 50-1.

³⁸ *The Lambeth Conference, 1948* (London: SPCK, 1948) II, 68-70; I, 42-3.

offered to the Anglican Church a chalice, an act interpreted as a wish for closer rapprochement. Indeed, in June of the next year, 1956, an Anglo-Russian Theological Conference was called in Moscow,³⁹ in which papers were read and discussions held on topics such as the History of Orthodox-Anglican relations, the nature of the Church and the role of the Laity, Holy Scripture and Tradition, the Creed and Councils (the Filioque Clause), the sacraments, Orthodox practices and Anglican Formularies. The Orthodox stated that full dogmatic union should be the prerequisite for any other unity. Both sides agreed that this unity can be achieved if agreement is reached on (1) the content of faith and its sources, Scripture and Tradition; (2) the Hierarchy; (3) the Sacraments. On many points the same opinions stated in former Orthodox-Anglican conversations were restated. The deliberations at Moscow form the first official theological conference between the Russian Orthodox and Anglican Churches. Thus, they have an advisory, preliminary and exploratory character, as it has been said by members of both Commissions. On the other hand, their purpose was to bring the Russian Orthodox to the same level which the relations of other Orthodox Churches with Anglicans reached in the past.

Chronologically, the last landmark of the present study is the Ninth Lambeth Conference of 1958.⁴⁰ The Orthodox delegates of the Churches of Constantinople, Russia, Rumania, and Bulgaria had only unofficial contacts with members of the Conference, which in a resolution (40) spoke again for the establishment of a Joint Anglican-Orthodox Doctrinal Commission.

THEOLOGICAL SCHOOL OF HALKI

³⁹ W. S. Schneirla, *op. cit.*, pp. 7-22. H. Waddams ed., *Anglo-Russian Theological Conference, Moscow, July, 1956* (London: The Faith Press, 1958)

⁴⁰ *The Lambeth Conference, 1958* (London: SPCK, 1958) I, 39; II, 49-50.



Copyright and Use:

As an ATLAS user, you may print, download, or send articles for individual use according to fair use as defined by U.S. and international copyright law and as otherwise authorized under your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement.

No content may be copied or emailed to multiple sites or publicly posted without the copyright holder(s)' express written permission. Any use, decompiling, reproduction, or distribution of this journal in excess of fair use provisions may be a violation of copyright law.

This journal is made available to you through the ATLAS collection with permission from the copyright holder(s). The copyright holder for an entire issue of a journal typically is the journal owner, who also may own the copyright in each article. However, for certain articles, the author of the article may maintain the copyright in the article. Please contact the copyright holder(s) to request permission to use an article or specific work for any use not covered by the fair use provisions of the copyright laws or covered by your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement. For information regarding the copyright holder(s), please refer to the copyright information in the journal, if available, or contact ATLA to request contact information for the copyright holder(s).

About ATLAS:

The ATLA Serials (ATLAS®) collection contains electronic versions of previously published religion and theology journals reproduced with permission. The ATLAS collection is owned and managed by the American Theological Library Association (ATLA) and received initial funding from Lilly Endowment Inc.

The design and final form of this electronic document is the property of the American Theological Library Association.

THE PROBLEM CONCERNING FAITH AND KNOWLEDGE,
OR REASON AND REVELATION, AS EXPOUNDED
IN THE LETTERS OF ST. BASIL THE GREAT
TO AMPHILOCHIUS OF ICONIUM*

By CONSTANTINE G. BONIS

I confess that I am possessed by deep emotion having ascended the pulpit of the Holy Cross Greek Orthodox Theological School, to which I was brought by your zeal and by the interest of the Greek Government as your co-worker and as a link between your School and the School of Theology of the University of Athens. I am grateful to His Grace, Rt. Rev. Bishop Athenagoras of Elaia, to the Dean of the School, the Very Rev. Archimandrite John Papadopoulos, and to the faculty for the opportunity to speak on this great and sacred day.

Since the second half of the eleventh century, when the renowned Metropolitan of Euhaita, a city of Asia Minor, first introduced today's Feast of the Three Great Hierarchs, the Orthodox Church and especially the Greeks have been annually celebrating the memory and glory of the Three Great Luminaries, the heaven-disclosing Basil, Gregory the Theologian and John the Goldenmouth, who by their excellent teaching, and especially by their interpretation of sacred doctrine, have set the world on fire and by the springs of divine knowledge have watered all creation.

Also, since 1842 when the Council of the University of Athens adapted this Feast Day by combining it with the Day of Letters, a festive combination already known and celebrated in the Secret Schools of the years of Turkish domination, the Higher Schools of learning and all the high schools and grammar schools of our country have been celebrating this day as their proper Feast, thus showing that they hold as the ideal of conduct and education what these excellent men held, who with Origen considered "human knowledge as an exercise of the soul, but divine knowledge as its perfection."

* A lecture delivered in the Chapel of Holy Cross Greek Orthodox Theological School in commemoration of the Feast Day of the "Three Hierarchs," January 30, 1959.

However, I confess that I gave much thought to the topic of my lecture, not because of any perplexity in finding one, but because of the difficulty of favoring and choosing one of the many, since the topics concerning those sacred men may well be described as a thousand times expounded; but, he who ascends the university tribune should present something new from his own wealth of knowledge and, thereby, further his own scientific field and at the same time favorably dispose his audience.

Thus, I judged it my duty, as a servant of Patrology and of the Interpretation of the Fathers, to present to you a personality very little known to the many, but of the first magnitude and of similar, as I believe, worth as the three great men, whom we are honoring today. I speak of Saint Amphilochius, Metropolitan of Iconium, as he is known to us by the 17 letters written to him by Saint Basil the Great. I shall limit myself to those few letters which deal with the important epistemological problem concerning the relationship between Faith and Knowledge, or Reason and Revelation. But before dealing with this problem, I consider it expedient to sketch, in general, the life of this saintly man.

I

Saint Amphilochius was probably born in Arianzus of Cappadocia (in Asia Minor) between the years 341 and 345. His father, likewise named Amphilochius, was a friend and fellow student of the famous sophist and rhetor Libanius and himself exercised the profession of rhetor. The elder Amphilochius was the brother of Nonna, the famous mother of Saint Gregory Nazianzus. Therefore, the younger Amphilochius was the first cousin of Saint Gregory. The mother of Amphilochius was Libia, whose premature death Gregory Nazianzus laments in the funeral oration dedicated to her.¹

”Ωφελες, ὅ Λιβία, γώειν τεκέσσι φίλοισιν,
 ”Ωφελες ἄχρι πύλαις γήραος ἐμπελάσαι!
 Νῦν δέ σε μοῖρον ἐδάμασσεν ἀώριον εἰσέτι καλήν,
 Εἰσέτι κουριδίοις ἀνθεσι λαμπομένην.
 Αἱ, αἱ! Ἀμφιλόχιος δὲ τεὸς πόσις ἀντὶ δάμαρτος
 Ἐσθλῆς καὶ πινυτῆς, τλήμονα τύμβον ἔχει.

Amphilochius and Libia had three children. St. Gregory writes, «Σῶν τε τριάς τεκέων, καὶ πόσις Ἀμφίλοχος».² The male children were

¹ Fun. Orat. to 6, Libia 26, Migne, P.G. 38, 24.

² *Ibid.*, 27.

Euphemius and Amphilochius. «Τίέες Ἀμφιλόχου Εὐφήμιος, Ἀμφιλόχός τε».³ But Euphemius died prematurely, «ἄρτι γενειάσων . . . , ἄρτι δ' ἔρωτας ἐς θαλάμους καλέων», at the very time he was about to be married, «εἰκοσετής . . . ἥλθ' ὑπὸ γαίην».⁴ The third child of Amphilochius and Libia was Theodosia, who after being married came to Constantinople where she became the governess of a girl named Olympias who later became so famous through the reverence paid her by Saint John Chrysostom who conducted a heavy correspondence with her when he was in exile.

Amphilochius went to Constantinople when he was twenty years old, studied with Libanius and practised the profession of rhetor. Because of inexperience, he became involved in a suspicious affair and was accused of bribery and was about to be brought to trial. His cousin, Gregory Nazianzus, who knew him well, did not for a moment believe the charge. Writing to Sophronius, the governor of Constantinople,⁵ Gregory ascertains that he would rather believe "someone of the unbelievable and paradoxical things than that he [Amphilochius] would do or even think [to do] anything ignoble for money. . . . Nothing escapes envy, for some word of blame has touched even him, a man who has fallen into the crime of simplicity rather than of evil ways."⁶

Very much upset, Amphilochius sought refuge at the estate of his father in Ozizale of Cappadocia where he devoted his time to the study of Holy Scriptures, of the works of the Church teachers, to prayer and fasting. Most graceful is the correspondence exchanged at that time between Amphilochius, leading in the desert an ascetic life, and Gregory Nazianzus.

Upon the death of Faustus, Bishop of Iconium in 373, Amphilochius was called from the desert by Saint Basil the Great to the succession upon the metropolitan throne of Iconium. Saint Basil the Great⁷ characteristically relates that God called Amphilochius from the desert "having charmed [him] with the inescapable nets of grace and by leading [him] to the middle of Pisidia." As Metropolitan of Iconium, Amphilochius was present at the Second Ecumenical Council and by

³ *Ibid.*

⁴ *Ibid.*, 29-30, Migne, P.G. 38, 25-6.

⁵ *Epist.* 22, Migne, P.G. 37, 57.

⁶ *Comp. Epist.* 23 and 24, Migne, P.G. 37, 57-60.

⁷ *Epist.* 161, Migne, P.G. 37, 57-60.

a decree of the 30th of July, 381,⁸ the Emperor Theodosius appointed Amphilochius of Iconium and Optimon of Pisidia of Antioch as those bishops in the diocese of Asia with whom all who wished to be considered Orthodox must be in communion. In 383 Amphilochius was present at the Synod in Side of Pamphylia which condemned the Massalians or Euchites, who rejected the Mysteries (Sacraments). By order of the Synod, Amphilochius wrote concerning their condemnation to Flavian of Antioch.⁹ In 394, he took part in the Synod of Constantinople which was convened to settle a strife between two Arab bishops, Bagadius and Agapius, both of whom claimed the bishopric of Bostra.¹⁰ After this date, we know nothing about the last years of Amphilochius who probably died between the years 395 and 400. The Church commemorates him the 23rd of November.

II

I do not intend, nor does time permit me, to discuss the literary productivity of Amphilochius and the exceptional place his personality occupies in the History of Dogmas, especially in relation to the determination of the dogma concerning the mutual relations of the three Persons in the Holy Trinity. At present, I wish only to enter upon a discussion of my topic, the relations between Amphilochius and Basil the Great and an analysis of those letters of Basil to Amphilochius concerning Faith and Knowledge, or Reason and Revelation.

We saw that Amphilochius was made Metropolitan of Iconium by St. Basil. From that time the ties between these two great men became steadily closer. A few months after his elevation to the metropolitan throne, he was invited to visit Basil in the Spring of the year 374 and remained with him a good length of time.¹¹ St. Basil requests of Amphilochius more frequent contacts and if this in the future proves impossible, he should at least arrange things in such a way that they would meet once a year. In August of the same year, St. Basil sent a new invitation to Amphilochius on the occasion of the feast commemorating Saint Eupsychius the Martyr (Sept. 7),¹² which, as it seems, was magnificently celebrated in Cappadocia by the gathering of many bishops and metropolitans from neighboring and far off districts. On

⁸ *Codex Theod.* 16, 1, 3.

⁹ Photius, *Myriobiblon* 52, Migne, *P.G.* 103, 88

¹⁰ Mansi 3, 851.

¹¹ Epist. 163, Migne, *P.G.* 32, 633 B.

¹² See Epist. 176, Migne, *P.G.* 32, 653 *Comp. Ep.* 200.

such occasions, friends of Basil the Great would convene ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό and exchange views on various ecclesiastical issues.¹³ Such was the joy of St. Basil over his personal meetings with Amphilochius, that, despite his premature aging (he was only 44 years old) and the serious bodily ailment which for so long was afflicting him, he did not desist from undertaking long and tedious journeys in order to meet his beloved spiritual child.¹⁴ The sparseness of personal contact because of distance was compensated by correspondence which steadily became more intimate. But their spiritual contact by letter was somewhat hampered because of the miserable conditions, especially in winter, of the only road between Iconium and Caesaria.¹⁵ Nevertheless, these saintly men missed no opportunity to dispatch letters to each other. A careful examination of the 17 extant letters of Saint Basil to Amphilochius reveals the fact that with the passing of time they became warmer in sentiments and more intimate. The Hierarch of the Cappadocian province, who is otherwise very grave, reserved and cautious, becomes now more condescending, effusive and warm toward the young Amphilochius as yet inexperienced in the complexities of theological and ecclesiastical matters. Perhaps this attitude toward Amphilochius was conditioned also by other causes. Perhaps the sharp disagreement with Eustathius of Sebasteia¹⁶ exercised not a small psychological influence in Basil's quest for consolation through the spiritual contacts with his only faithful and dedicated friend and spiritual child. This becomes more probable when one takes into consideration the fact that Saint Gregory Nazianzus continued to be ill-disposed toward his otherwise beloved friend Basil who had elevated him by coercion to the episcopal throne of Sasima.¹⁷ At this time, even Saint Basil's brothers were not visiting him regularly. Also in the diocese of his brother, Saint Gregory of Nyssa, serious difficulties arose which created for him a distasteful situation. Having these things in mind, it is easy to understand the importance Saint Basil attributed to his contacts with Amphilochius and why he considered him as the substitute of his beloved ones and as the only consolation in his afflictions and grief. Indeed, the tender expressions of St. Basil toward Amphilochius are impressive. In one of his letters he writes, "when I took into my hands the letter of your

¹³ Comp. Ep. 100, Εὐσεβίῳ Σαμοσάτων 176 and 200, 'Αμφιλοχίῳ Ἰκονίου and 252, 'Επισκόποις τῆς Ποντικῆς διοικήσεως. See also Ep. 58 Gregory Nazianzus, Migne, P.G. 37, 116 A.

¹⁴ Comp. Ep. 202 and 217, Migne, P.G. 32, 736, 793.

¹⁵ See Ep. 199, Migne, P.G. 32, 716 C: Ep. 231, Migne, P.G. 32, 861 A.

¹⁶ See Loofs, *Eustathius von Sebaste* (Halle, 1898) p. 62 ff.

¹⁷ See Ep. 217, Migne, P.G. 32, 793 B/C.

Piety I straightway became forgetful of everything, since I had received symbols of both the sweetest voice of all to me and also of the dearest hand."¹⁸ Amphilochius certainly proved worthy of the high estimation and love of his friend and patron. This is ascertained by St. Basil himself who now accepts the opinions and advice of Amphilochius in ecclesiastical and other matters. To Amphilochius, he writes, "for many reasons do I desire to meet you, both that I may employ you as an adviser on the matters in hand, and in general that, beholding you after a long time, I may have some consolation for your absence."¹⁹

Indeed, Amphilochius was fortunate and blessed with having such a patron, friend and father and such an incomparable teacher, peerless in all generations. He was able to travel the difficult path of his high calling with a firm footing, fearless of contrarities and not shrinking before the difficulties of the moment. For every matter which arose beyond his own experience and ability, for every theological, ecclesiastical, philosophical and even grammatical perplexity he had a handy and sure recourse for seeking and finding the proper solution and answer. Between the lines of their correspondence, one discerns the favor, kindness, tenderness and condescension with which Basil the Great answers the most diverse questions of his friend. But when one recognizes the theological weakness and general inexperience of the young Amphilochius, who had not as yet tasted of the difficult theological problems, he can understand how Amphilochius was compelled to place before the wise judgment and learned experience of his spiritual father even the most paradoxical matters in order to learn the correct solution and answer to the proffered questions. In other words, Amphilochius seems now compelled to begin with the fundamentals of theology and from the questions he puts to Basil, it appears he was not confident that he could himself without aid give the proper interpretation and solution to even the common and off-hand questions. At one time, he asks his wise teacher to interpret the meaning of "Heimarmene" and to supply proofs against this teaching. In spite of the willingness with which St. Basil always answered the questions put to him by the young Amphilochius, on this point he does not hide his sadness when he writes, "do not seek arguments from us, but wound them with the barbs of their own rhetoric."²⁰

¹⁸ Ep. 217, Migne, *P.G.* 32, 793 B. See also Ep. 218, Migne, *P.G.* 32, 809 B; Ep. 231, *ibid.*, 32, 861 A; Ep. 232, *ibid.*, 32, 864 A.

¹⁹ Ep. 201, Migne, *P.G.* 32, 736 B.

²⁰ Ep. 236, Migne, *P.G.* 32, 881 D.

Saint Amphilochius applied himself in earnest to theological studies. But he realized that if he proceeded without plan he would aimlessly sail the open seas without being able to reach quickly the harbor of complete theological knowledge which he eagerly desired. Thus, from the very first, he understood that the Alpha and Omega of theological thought and knowledge was the assiduous study of Holy Scripture. Where he met difficulties concerning the understanding of a text or even of a phrase, he would immediately address himself to his wise interpreter in order to be informed of the correct sense and meaning. Letter 236 of St. Basil to Amphilochius²¹ is an answer to theological questions concerning Holy Scripture. He asks for the correct interpretation of Mark 13, 32: "But of that day and hour no one knoweth, not the Angels of heaven, but the Father alone." Also what is the meaning of the verse in Jerem. 22, 28-30: "Jechonias was dishonest like a vessel for which there is no use, because he was expelled and cast out into a land which he knew not"? Also what is the difference between the terms *οὐσία* and *ὑπόστασις*? Finally, which are those things which are "by nature good" and which are "neutral and indifferent"? The rhetor and punctilious Amphilochius does not omit to question his wise teacher even on certain grammatical issues. Should one accent the components made up from the word *φάγος* (glutton) on the antepenult or the penult? St. Basil does not hesitate to answer even this question: "And as for *φάγος*, we place the accent on the penult."²²

Also matters of current ecclesiastical nature and theological interest are put forth by Amphilochius to Saint Basil for solution. The Bishop of Iconium was especially concerned with the then circulating heretical teachings about the relationship between Reason and Revelation, or Faith and Knowledge. St. Basil was obliged to answer his difficulties in a work which he divided into four letters in order to preserve "the metre of epistolography." We will proceed with an analysis of the contents of these letters which are important in themselves and for theological science generally.

III

LETTER 233²³

These four letters of St. Basil to Amphilochius are numbered 232-235. Because the first of these letters (though it is somehow an intro-

²¹ Migne, *P.G.* 32, 881 D.

²² Migne, *P.G.* 32, 884 A.

²³ Migne, *P.G.*, 32, 864/8.

duction to the main topic) deals rather with topics outside the scope of this paper, we shall proceed to an analysis of letter 233 which is actually the first answer to the question which concerns us here.

The first question which Amphilochius asked St. Basil was, "What is the activity of the mind?" and in some manuscripts this appears as the title of the letter. One may wonder why Amphilochius asks this question. I believe that one is not far from the truth in considering this to be an outcome of Amphilochius' dialogue with the Eunomians. I presume this because St. Basil discusses the same question repeatedly in his work "Against Eunomius." In answering his friend and student, St. Basil expounds concisely and on the basis of dialectics the Christian viewpoint on this important problem which has caused much discussion among modern philosophers.²⁴

St. Basil's reasoning on this problem is as follows:

1. The basis of the whole epistemological problem is expressed by the very first phrase of the letter. "I know, and having myself heard this, I understand the constitution of men." Man knows having of himself, *eo ipso* and *a priori*, the ability to know. However, he enriches his knowledge by hearing and external representations (empirical knowledge). His "mind" creates the ability to know which naturally inheres in man. Therefore, no sensible man can blame this great human good. On the contrary, he ought to confess "that the mind is good" and especially because "in it we have what is according to the image of the Creator." But since "the mind is good," it follows that objectively and in itself considered "the activity of the mind is good" also. However, the mind is ever-moving (ἀεικίνητος), but "being ever-moving, many times it imagines non-existing things as if existing [an indirect censure of Platonic idealism], and many times it is borne directly to the truth." This motion, whether toward truth and good, or toward falsehood and evil, is intensified by conduct and influence from without. According to Christian teaching, man tends toward the one with the help of grace and toward the other by the incitement of the devil. "But since in this [the mind] two powers have sprouted, according to our opinion who believe in God, the one wicked, that of demons, drawing us along to their own apostasy, the other more divine and good, leading us up to the likeness of God." Besides these two powers, St. Basil accepts a third condition which we may name simply «ἀπαθῆ» or «ἀδιά-

²⁴ See e.g. art. "Vernunft" in Rudolf Eisler's *Wörterbuch der Philosophischen Begriffe* (Berlin 1930, III, 395/406).

φορον». It is the condition in which a man who has not been taught and enlightened remains within himself contemplating small things and discerning things commensurate with himself. "Whenever the mind remains within itself, it contemplates small things and things commensurate with itself. . . ." But complete confusion ensues when he gives himself over to evil teachers and having destroyed the criterion in himself falls completely into imagining non-existent and queer beings (ideas or things). He is here censuring, I believe, the imaginations of the ancient Greek philosophers, especially of the Pythagorians, Heracleitus, etc., and of the gnostic heresies in general, which, having mixed the fantasies of ancient philosophical systems with the strange religious ideas of Oriental people especially, were reduced to the most peculiar and strange views concerning the world and man. "When it [the mind] yields to those who deceive it, having obscured its own judgment, it becomes involved in strange fancies. Then it even thinks that wood is not wood but God; and it considers that gold is not money but an object of worship." One becomes exempt from these devious things of the mind when he inclines toward the more divine, namely, when he embraces the Christian Orthodox faith and teachings concerning the world "and accepts the graces of the Spirit" and "becomes apprehensive of the more divine, as far as is commensurate with its [the mind's] nature." The activities of the mind, therefore are analogous to and numerically equal with the conditions of life. Just as the moral life of each one is guided in all activity either by the Orthodox faith, or by unbelief, or heretical belief, or finally by indifference to religious issues, in a similar way the activities of our mind, being numerically equal, are incited to good or evil, or remain in an intermediate state. "Now there are three states of life, as it were, and of like number with these are the activities of our mind. For either our practices are wicked and wicked evidently the movements of our mind; for example, adulteries, thefts, idolatries, calumnies, contentions, wraths, quarrels, vainglory, and such as the apostle Paul enumerated among 'the works of the flesh'; (or our practices are virtuous); or the activity of the soul is somewhat intermediate or indifferent, having nothing about it either to be condemned or to be praised; as the acquisition of those mechanical arts which as you know we call indifferent, of their own account inclining in no way either to virtue or to wickedness. For what kind of wickedness is there in the art of the pilot or the physician? They are not, however, virtues in themselves, but from the choice of those who make use of them they incline to the direction of one or the other of the opposite states. But the mind that is united to the divinity of the Spirit is already a witness of great

visions and observes the divine beauties, but only to the extent that grace allows and its constitution admits."

2. These are the divisions of the activity of the mind based on dialectics and philosophy and objectively understood in relation to its external manifestation. Now the question arises, "What is the purpose for which the activity of the mind was given?" Leaving aside the dialectical questions and answers, St. Basil offers a clear, practical and from the Christian viewpoint a very useful answer to this question, "Therefore let them, dismissing those dialectical questions, inquire into the truth, not mischievously, but reverently. The judgment of the mind has been given us for the apprehension of the truth. And our God is Truth itself." The knowledge of Self-Truth, namely, of God, is inherent in human nature. "Therefore it is antecedent to the mind to know our God, but to know Him in such a way as is possible for the infinitely great to be known by the very small." This natural ability to know God, that is, His existence, in no way means a knowledge of His essence. This is impossible for finite man. But this again does not mean than man cannot know the existence and attributes of God. In order to make this clear, St. Basil offers proof from the natural world. "For not even when eyes have been directed to the apprehension of visible things are all visible things brought at once into sight. For not even the hemisphere of the heavens is observed in one glance, but an appearance of vision surrounds us, and in truth there are many things in it, not to say all, which are not known: the nature of the stars, their magnitude, intervals, movements, concurrences, distances, the other relations, the very essence of the firmament, the depth from the concave circumference to the convex surface. But yet we would not say that the heavens are invisible on account of what is unknown, but that they are visible on account of the partial apprehension of them. So certainly also regarding God." Finally, the following noteworthy points are brought forth: "If the mind has been injured by demons, it will worship idols, or will be turned aside to some other form of impiety. But if it gives itself up to the assistance of the Spirit, it will know the truth and recognize God. However, it will recognize Him, as the Apostle said, in part, but in the life after this more perfectly. For, 'when that which is perfect is come, that which is in part shall be done away.' (1 Cor. 13, 10)." Let no one, therefore do away with the judgment of the mind. It was given by God and is therefore good, its purpose and end being the knowledge of God and the comprehension of Self-Truth. "Therefore the judgment of the mind is both noble and given to a useful end, the apprehension of God, operating, however, only so far as it is able to bear."

LETTER 234²⁵

In letter 234 we are confronted with the essential problem of theology concerning the limits of Knowledge and Faith in relation to the Essence of God. This great problem has not been properly and adequately examined from the Orthodox point of view. The current dogmatic textbooks in use usually deal with this great and basic problem, so important for Orthodox theology, only superficially and deficiently. This constitutes the very center of gravity of the whole field of theology and the axis of philosophical thought. In philosophy the whole question is the kernel of "Epistemology" and from the theological viewpoint comprises the Alpha and Omega of Christian "Soteriology." Faith and Knowledge or Knowledge and Faith? Which precedes and which follows? What is the relation between them? To which point may our Knowledge be traced and from where does Faith begin? Then what is the nature of each of these? Great problems, but basic problems, the solution of which is sought primarily by three sciences, Philosophy, Psychology and Theology, each one starting from its own presuppositions. I can not at this time undertake (nor would it be proper to digress from my main topic) the development of this very important problem. Simply starting from the treatment of this basic topic in the letters of the truly great philosopher, theologian and Archbishop of the Cappadocian Church, I both propose and pray that a Greek Orthodox dogmatician may sometime undertake a detailed treatment and investigation of this problem because I firmly believe that such a study will greatly contribute to our modern theological endeavor and in a very important manner strengthen our Church from the practical viewpoint. But he who will undertake such a task must have a solid philosophical formation and must have a complete and sure command of all related patristic materials. The Fathers of our Church were able more than anyone else to answer this problem and formulate correct and incontrovertible opinions for all ages because they were animated by the Holy Spirit, inspired by a living and active Faith and because they had a complete and universal command of philosophy. But I must not omit to mention from this pulpit that Father Romanides often-times took occasion to deal successfully and in a pioneering manner with this problem in his doctoral thesis concerning Original Sin²⁶ submitted to the Theological School of the University of Athens. I will here limit myself to an analysis of this basic issue as it appears in letters 234 and 235 of St. Basil to Amphilochius.

²⁵ Migne, P.G., 32, 868/72A.

²⁶ J. S. Romanides, *Original Sin* (Athens 1957).

1. "What is the Essence of God?" St. Basil does not answer this question directly and immediately. He seeks from the very beginning to disarm the negative dialectical syllogisms of the heretics by himself proposing the dilemma as well as the answer. His logical series of syllogisms, based on negative dialectics, lead naturally to conclusions contrary to those proposed by both heretics and unbelievers. He who puts forth the dilemma asks, "Do you worship what you know or what you do not know? If we answer: 'What we know, that do we adore,' straightway is the retort from them: 'What is the essence of that which is adored?' And if we confess that we are ignorant of the essence, again turning around to us they say: 'Then you adore that which you do not know.'" St. Basil immediately proceeds to prove that this statement of the case is a "sophism." You put forth this dilemma thinking that it will put us in a difficult position and lead us to conclusions consonant with your reasoning. But after your question follows our question to which you must now give an answer. What is the nature of "knowing"? Indeed we ourselves can give the answer to your question. "But we say that 'knowing' has many meanings. For instance, we say that we know the greatness of God, and His power, and His wisdom, and His goodness, and His providence whereby He cares for us, and the justice of His judgment, not His very essence." Thus the first question was misleading and sophistical. "For he who says that he does not know the essence has not confessed that he does not know God, since the concept of God is gathered by us from the many things which we have enumerated." But the sophist may say that all this is good and incontrovertible. Tell me, however, is God "simple" or not? Certainly He is simple. Then in such a case "everything that one enumerates of Him as knowable is of His essence." St. Basil proves this to be a sophism inferior to the preceding one. "But this is a sophism that involves countless absurdities." Where are the absurdities of this "sophism" to be found according to St. Basil? In the fact that the "sophists" confuse the "Essence" and "Attributes" of God. The simplicity of God which lies in His Essence, must in no way be confused with the divine activities which we call "Attributes." Being different from each other, they are, nevertheless, in their totality manifest as indicating His Essence. The variety of names of the divine "Attributes" should not mislead us to the false opinion that they indicate differences concerning the divine Essence. The energies of God are varied, but His Essence is simple. We say that we know God from His activities without affirming any understanding of His essence. "For His activities descend to us, but His essence remains inaccessible." These are the words of St. Basil himself. "The things which have been enumerated being so many, are all these names of one essence? And

are His awfulness and His benevolence equivalent to each other, His justice and His creative power, His foreknowledge and His requiting, His magnificence and His providence? Or, indeed, whatever of these things we say, do we indicate His essence? For if they say this, let them not ask if we know the essence of God, but let them learn of us if we know the awfulness of God, or His justice, or benevolence. These things we confess to know. But if they say essence is something else, let them not mislead us by citing its simplicity. For they themselves have confessed that essence is one thing and each of what was enumerated was another. But the activities are varied and the essence is simple. We say that from His activities we know our God, but the essence itself we do not profess to approach. For His activities descend to us, but His substance remains inaccessible."

2. With his fine syllogistic sword St. Basil cuts the proposed sophisms and by their own weapons of logical categories he utterly overthrows the sophistical syllogisms of his opponents. The sophist answers the Christian profession of ignorance concerning the divine Essence with the charge that this is therefore an ignorance of God Himself. But St. Basil reverses the syllogism and answers that the sophist who claims that he knows the essence of God proves that he does not even know himself, and is like a man bitten by a mad dog and beside himself, beholding the dog in his plate and proven to be miserable and deplorable exactly because he thinks he sees more than those who are well and then things which in reality do not exist. Speaking seriously, St. Basil is in effect saying that we should leave the sophisms and foolish games of the heretics. We do not know the essence of God, but we do know His attributes. This is enough for our salvation. We know the divine energies, or the divine attributes and we believe in the existence of the divine Essence and Persons. This faith in the existence of God, which is not a knowledge of the essence of God, is sufficient for the true Christian. It is exactly this realization of the unknowability of the divine Nature which is the creative element of Christian faith and at the same time a sure knowledge of the existence of the divine Essence. To believe in the existence of the Essence of God, and not to understand the fulness of this Essence, is venerable and blessed. Here are the words of St. Basil himself: "'But,' it is said, 'if you are ignorant of His essence, you are ignorant of Him.' But do you retort: 'If you say that you know His essence, you do not understand Him.' For neither does a man bitten by a mad dog, beholding the dog in his plate, see more than those who are well; nay, for this reason he is pitiable — since he thinks that he beholds what he does not see. Then do not wonder at him for his declaration, but adjudge

him pitiable for his derangement. Therefore, know that the saying is of mockers: 'If you are ignorant of the essence of God, you worship what you do not know.' But I do know that He exists, but what His essence is I consider beyond understanding. How then am I saved? Through faith. And it is faith enough to know that God is, not what He is, and that He is a rewarder of those who seek Him. Knowledge of His divine essence, then, is the perception of His Incomprehensibility; and that is to be worshiped, not whose essence is known, but whose essence exists."

3. Countering the false fancies of the Eunomians who claimed that it is possible to know God directly and that the Essence of God is Ungeneratedness, St. Basil offers proofs from Holy Scripture. According to Scripture, "No man hath seen God at any time; the only begotten Son Who is in the bosom of the Father, He hath declared." (John 1, 18) But what has the Son declared, the Essence or the Power? If the power, then as much as He declared unto us so much we know. But the Eunomians claimed that the Essence of God is His Ungeneratedness which the Son revealed. Therefore, He has made known to us His very Essence. But being at a loss the great bishop asks, "Where did He say that His Ungeneratedness is Essence? That God never revealed His Essence either through the Son in the New Testament or through the prophets and other holy men in the Old Testament is proven by examples of holy men who learned of the existence of God by knowing His energies, and thus having believed they worshiped Him. Therefore, as it were, worship on the one hand is a product of faith, and faith is the outcome of the discernment of the Energies of God. If one were to say that by knowing first, then he believes, we can agree with him, but only on condition that he confesses with us, that that which we know concerning God, is not His Essence, but His powers and activities. We confess, therefore, that we know God from His activities and so we believe in Him Who was known and we worship Him Who was believed. St. Basil expresses the Orthodox understanding of our knowledge of God by His activities as follows: 'And let them in turn be questioned as follows: 'No man hath seen God at any time: the only begotten Son Who is in the bosom of the Father, He hath declared.' (John 1, 18) What has the only begotten of the Father declared? His essence or His power? If His power, as much as He has declared to us, so much we know. If His essence, tell where He has told that Unbegottenness is His Essence? When did Abraham worship? Was it not when he believed? But when did he believe? Was it not when he was called? Where, then, herein is testimony given by Scripture to his comprehending? And the dis-

ciples, when did they worship Him? Was it not when they saw that creation was subject to Him? For from sea and winds that obeyed Him they knew His Godhead. Therefore from the activities is the knowledge, and from the knowledge is the worship. 'Do you believe that I can do this? I believe Lord,' (Math. 9,28) and he worshiped Him. Thus worship follows faith, and faith is strengthened by power. But if you say that he who believes also knows, from what he believes, from this also he knows; or even the reverse, from what he knows, from this also he believes. But we know God from His power. Therefore we believe in Him Who was known, and we worship Him Who was believed."

LETTER 235²⁷

In Letter 235 St. Basil offers a solution to the important question, "Which is first, knowledge or faith?" In order to avoid any confusion between these two concepts, the wise bishop from the very beginning clearly distinguishes (as is done in modern philosophy) between Metaphysical Knowledge and Empirical Knowledge on the one hand and Religious Faith and Empirical Faith on the other. "Empirical Faith" precedes "Empirical Knowledge," but "Knowledge" of the energies of God precedes "Religious Faith." Faith in the existence of God is usually followed by worship. St. Basil's arguments and syllogisms on this point are magnificent. "Which is first, knowledge or faith? But we say that generally, in the sciences, faith goes before knowledge, but in our own teaching, even if someone says that knowledge must exist before faith, we do not disagree — knowledge, however, commensurate with human comprehension. For in the sciences one must first take it on faith that the letter spoken is alpha, and later, having learned the characters and their pronunciations, grasp also the exact notion of the force of such letter. But in faith in God, the notion of the existence of God precedes, and this notion we gather from His works. For it is by perceiving His wisdom and power and goodness and all His invisible qualities as seen from the creation of the world that we come to a knowledge of Him. Thus we also accept Him as our Lord. For since God is the creator of the whole world, and we are part of the world, God is therefore our creator also. And faith follows this knowledge, and worship follows such faith."

With abundant gracefulness and at the same time with clarity, brevity and simplicity St. Basil expounds the whole "epistemological"

²⁷ Migne, P.G., 32, 872A/876A.

problem, offering in a few lines a clear and incontrovertible exposition of the various meanings of "Knowledge." The very word "Knowledge" has many meanings. Therefore mistaken are those who understand knowledge as simple and unique, especially in the sphere of metaphysics and religion, and think that we are wrong and they are right in claiming the possibility of knowing the Essence of God. Of course, St. Basil does not proceed to phenomenological theories. Nevertheless, by the use of wise examples from experience he seeks to prove that man by nature both knows and at the same time does not know certain things. How much more so is this true in regard to supersentient and metaphysical things, the perception of which he acquires from the creations of God. For example, if I were asked whether I know what sand is, I shall, of course, answer that I know. But if it were demanded of me to give the number of sand, I could not, of course, but answer that I do not know. Likewise, if one were to ask me if I know Timothy, I shall answer that I both know and do not know him. I know his external appearance and his other characteristics, but I am ignorant of his essence. I would answer the same thing concerning myself. I know who I am, but I am ignorant of my essence.

How simple, how clear, but also how evidently persuasive are the arguments of St. Basil. Who does not admire the divinely inspired wisdom of this wise man? Great philosophical and theological problems, which have occupied and do occupy the greatest and most noble minds, are expounded and solved simply, unaffectedly and gracefully, so that the student of the religious and philosophical thought of St. Basil is seized by astonishment and admiration. Only he who penetrates the superb thought of this glorious man is able to properly appreciate his grandeur.

But let us allow St. Basil himself to give expression to his views on the problem in question: "But now, since the word 'knowledge' is of many significations, those who mock at the more guileless, and who likewise make a display with their paradoxes (just as the theatre folk filch away their pebbles in the full view of everybody), by using the universal term in their questioning make away with the whole issue. For since the word 'knowledge' has a wide sweep, and a thing is knowable with respect to number, and size, and power, and manner of existing, and time of generation, and essence, these men, taking the universal meaning of knowledge in their questioning, if they find us confessing that we know, demand of us knowledge of the essence; and if they see that we are cautious about making an answer, they turn upon us the reproach of impiety. But our position is that we confess

that we know what is knowable about God, and yet to 'know' anything, on the other hand, that escapes our comprehension is impossible. So, for instance, if you ask me if I know what sand is, and I answer that I do, you will obviously be using a sophistical trick if you straightway go on and demand its number, because your first question referred to the external appearance of sand, but the second, a sophistical trick, was turned back to refer to the number of it. This sophism is like that of one who says: 'Do you know Timothy? Then if you know Timothy, you know also his nature; but you have confessed that you know Timothy; give us therefore the description of Timothy's nature.' But I both know Timothy and do not know him, yet not in the same way and in the same respect. For my not knowing him is not on the same plane as my knowing him, but in one way I know and in another I am ignorant of him. For I know him by his external appearance and his other characteristics, but I am ignorant of his essence. For thus and in this sense I both know and am ignorant even of myself. For I know myself, who I am, but I do not know myself, insofar as I am ignorant of my essence."

Here ends the argumentation of St. Basil with regard to the great problem of our Theology concerning the relationship between Faith and Knowledge, or Reason and Revelation. The thought of this great man, clear in itself, obvious and incontestable, like a two-edged sword cuts the logically correct from the illogical, the truth from falsehood, and distinguishes the clear and unmixed limits of the two concepts "Faith" and "Knowledge," and at the same time indicates to him who believes correctly that both are necessary for our salvation. The human mind is finite and powerless to understand the infinite in its fulness. St. Paul was taken up to the third heaven and "heard unspeakable words, which it is not lawful (*οὐκ ἔξον*) for a man to utter." (II Cor. 12, 4) The *οὐκ ἔξον* means that by nature man is unable to understand and even less able to define ideal (*ἰδεατὰς*) and spiritual meanings. Man is by nature unable adequately to describe and define even the most simple concepts which are part of his daily life. For example, he seeks to describe the meaning of Truth, Justice, Good and the like by referring them to their opposites without being able categorically to define them. He can say that Justice is whatever Injustice is not, Truth is whatever Falsehood is not, and God is whatever Evil is not. Nevertheless, he feels and lives these concepts daily without being able in the least to define their essence adequately. How much more, therefore, does the essence of God transcend human reason. For this cause St. Paul declares: "For we know in part, and we prophesy in part; but when that which is perfect is come, that which is in part shall be done away. When I was a child, I spake as a child, I felt as a child, I thought as

a child; now that I am become a man, I have put away the things of a child. For now we see in a mirror in riddle, but then face to face; now I know in part, but then shall I know fully even as also I was fully known." (I Cor. 13, 9-12) What is now lacking in Knowledge is compensated by Faith. "But now abideth faith, hope, love, these three; and the greatest of these is love. (I Cor. 13, 13)

I tried to present to you in this lecture one aspect of the spiritual life and thought not only of two great bishops, but also of two great Greeks. Before I finish allow me to turn my attention to the beloved youth who are studying in this beautiful Greek Orthodox Theological School of Holy Cross and remind them that they are descendants of great and glorious ancestors. Let them, therefore, embrace their great ancestors as their own protectors and guardians and let them look to them as everlasting examples of piety, virtue and culture. Do not forget that you have accepted to become Fathers and Teachers of our fellow countrymen, of our genuine Greek brothers, of those glorious descendants of glorious ancestors, and you will be called upon to give an account for your pastorship of their souls. You are called to become the good shepherds of the Greeks of the dispersion, their good teachers and illuminators, the good sowers of Orthodoxy, the noble pioneers of a higher and more spiritual civilization, founded upon American freedom on the one hand and the excellent Greek culture and wisdom on the other. You are called on to communicate to the noble souls of our brothers whatever beautiful, exalted and noble has been produced by Greek-Christian civilization. Let your faith shine like the light and let your works be in proportion to your high and sacred mission. Then you will also become true "Fathers" of our most Holy Church and true Teachers of piety, virtue, and culture, modelling yourselves according to the example of the Three Hierarchs whose feast we are celebrating today. I pray that their works will become for you an object of continuous study and enjoyment.

SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY

UNIVERSITY OF ATHENS



Copyright and Use:

As an ATLAS user, you may print, download, or send articles for individual use according to fair use as defined by U.S. and international copyright law and as otherwise authorized under your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement.

No content may be copied or emailed to multiple sites or publicly posted without the copyright holder(s)' express written permission. Any use, decompiling, reproduction, or distribution of this journal in excess of fair use provisions may be a violation of copyright law.

This journal is made available to you through the ATLAS collection with permission from the copyright holder(s). The copyright holder for an entire issue of a journal typically is the journal owner, who also may own the copyright in each article. However, for certain articles, the author of the article may maintain the copyright in the article. Please contact the copyright holder(s) to request permission to use an article or specific work for any use not covered by the fair use provisions of the copyright laws or covered by your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement. For information regarding the copyright holder(s), please refer to the copyright information in the journal, if available, or contact ATLA to request contact information for the copyright holder(s).

About ATLAS:

The ATLA Serials (ATLAS®) collection contains electronic versions of previously published religion and theology journals reproduced with permission. The ATLAS collection is owned and managed by the American Theological Library Association (ATLA) and received initial funding from Lilly Endowment Inc.

The design and final form of this electronic document is the property of the American Theological Library Association.

commonly employed in Christian religious art and liturgical practice. Each drawing is based on a study of the many uses in art of the symbol it represents; it is not a reproduction of any one use but a careful rendering of the essential elements of the symbol. The brief, incisive text explains the origin and meaning of each symbol and relates it to appropriate passages in the Scriptures and in the Patristic writings. Where there is any significant difference in the wording of the texts, both the King James and the Douai Versions are cited.

The symbols are arranged in dictionary order, from A to X, for ready reference. The Index includes full cross-references.

Artists, architects and designers, as well as students and teachers of religion, will find this clear and authoritative handbook invaluable.

LeRoy H. Appleton is an artist and typographer, the author of *Indian Art of the Americas* (Scribner's, 1950); Stephen Bridges is a designer of stained glass and a lifelong student of liturgical practice.

JOHN E. REXINE

LOUIS LINN and LEO SCHWARZ, *Psychiatry and Religious Experience*. New York: Random House, 1958. Pp. 307.

Psychiatry and Religious Experience is one of those rare books which can be recommended to the beginner in the field of pastoral psychology as well as to the more advanced. On the one hand, it treats a sufficient variety of problem areas to give the student a panoramic view of the needs pastoral psychology is trying to meet. Yet the authors speak so convincingly and substantiate their conclusions with such sound evidence and scholarly research that the book has value for any reader. Some of the areas which Linn and Schwarz (a medical doctor and a chaplain) deal with, for example, are "The Domains of Psychiatry and Religion," "Religious Development in Childhood," "Religious Conflict and Values in Adolescence," "The Basic Principles of Religious Counseling," "Religion in Sex and Marriage," "Understanding Illness," "Facing Bereavement," "Religion and the Aging," and others.

One unique feature of this book is that it clearly shows the limitations of psychiatry and religion respectively when either one ignores the other. The underlying theme of the book is that all knowledge comes from God and is good and should be used to meet human need. If man's happiness and salvation are the highest goals in life, why limit

the approach to them by seeking them just through "science" or just through "religion"? This is what the authors imply by the spirit of their book. And their point is very well made as they show through plenty of clinical examples the success made by the cooperative teamwork of psychiatry and religion in meeting and solving everyday problems.

Linn and Schwarz, themselves well-trained in the art of counseling, reveal deep insight into the cause and solution of many human problems. Whether they are speaking of problems in sex and marriage or those in adolescence or those in bereavement they display masterful and skillful interpretations and illustrate whatever they say with case histories.

One conceivable criticism of *Psychiatry and Religious Experience* is the fact that no discrimination is made in the type of religious experience or religious leader being referred to. Yet this makes a book of this nature flexible where it might have been rigid; useful to many where it might have had very little appeal to as many groups as it does had it been more specific.

No book that deals with as many problems as does Linn and Schwarz's could really treat each one thoroughly. Volumes have been devoted to any one of the topics included therein. Yet the concisely dealt with subjects are handled adequately enough to make this a good textbook in the field of pastoral psychology. An excellent bibliography of both psychological and religious classics at the end of the book offers a satisfying supplement to each chapter. Surely, *Psychiatry and Religious Experience* will serve as a wonderful guide in counseling in the library of every clergyman.

ALEXANDER VERONIS

HENRY J. CADBURY, *The Book of Acts in History*. London: A. & C. Black, 1955. Pp. 170.

In this book, an eminent professor emeritus of Harvard University brings to focus the epoch in which the Christian Church was established. It is an attempt to present the circumstances, the intellectual and cultural climate in which the apostles and mainly the Apostle Paul worked for the realization of the Kingdom of God upon the earth. It discusses customs, traditions, legends, and philosophical trends as they become evident through the Book of Acts. This "earliest little essay of Church history is one of the most interesting and important narratives ever written," the author declares. It is a continuous account



Copyright and Use:

As an ATLAS user, you may print, download, or send articles for individual use according to fair use as defined by U.S. and international copyright law and as otherwise authorized under your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement.

No content may be copied or emailed to multiple sites or publicly posted without the copyright holder(s)' express written permission. Any use, decompiling, reproduction, or distribution of this journal in excess of fair use provisions may be a violation of copyright law.

This journal is made available to you through the ATLAS collection with permission from the copyright holder(s). The copyright holder for an entire issue of a journal typically is the journal owner, who also may own the copyright in each article. However, for certain articles, the author of the article may maintain the copyright in the article. Please contact the copyright holder(s) to request permission to use an article or specific work for any use not covered by the fair use provisions of the copyright laws or covered by your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement. For information regarding the copyright holder(s), please refer to the copyright information in the journal, if available, or contact ATLA to request contact information for the copyright holder(s).

About ATLAS:

The ATLA Serials (ATLAS®) collection contains electronic versions of previously published religion and theology journals reproduced with permission. The ATLAS collection is owned and managed by the American Theological Library Association (ATLA) and received initial funding from Lilly Endowment Inc.

The design and final form of this electronic document is the property of the American Theological Library Association.

the study and understanding of the formative four centuries of the beginning of our era.

COSTAS M. PROUSSIS

H. J. ROSE, *Religion in Greece and Rome* (Harper Torchbooks TB55). With a New Introduction by the author. New York: Harper and Brothers, Publishers, 1959. Pp. xiv and 312. Paper-bound. \$1.60.

What we have in this convenient paperback format is the combination of two already tested and proved books on ancient religion by the famous classical scholar, H. J. Rose. The original volumes were published under the titles *Ancient Greek Religion* (1946) and *Ancient Roman Religion* by Hutchinson & Co., Ltd., of London.

There can be no doubt that the new publishers, Harper and Brothers, are doing the reading public a valuable service by bringing these two books together in a single volume because these two books undoubtedly constituted and still constitute the two best short books available for an excellent view of the ancient Greek and Roman religions.

Ancient Greek and Roman religions were religions of cult and were polytheistic as well as creedless. It is always difficult for the modern reader, used to Christianity and Judaism, to project himself backward into a period and place in the historical sequence of events in which religion was much more a matter of ritual than dogma, much more a matter of observing form than faith, in which religion was not formally committed to any particular system of ethics, in which religion never developed an influential clergy and certainly one whose control over political situations was far from determining the actual course of political events. Yet both Greek and Roman religions were committed to maintaining the organized state and had strong family, clan or tribal associations.

Professor Rose ably presents the reader with the most characteristics of Greek and Roman religions in his work. His fundamental contributions, it seems to me, consists in bringing to the reader's attention the religious practices of the ordinary Greek and Roman, something that can easily be missed, if one reads *only* classical literature.

There are, of course, important differences between Greek and Roman religion, though animism ("the conception of all manner of

objects in the visible world as having in them something like a soul which, crudely enough pictured in most cases, is postulated as governing the bodies of men and beasts") and dynamism ("the notion that there exists a kind of power, different from that power which is to be observed in ordinary muscular exertions and so forth, in which numerous favoured men and, still more, sundry non-human beings, varying from beasts to ghosts and gods, and also various processes, generally of a magical kind, are thought to share"—Polynesian and Melanesian "mana," Latin "numen," Greek "daimon") are certainly two fundamental characteristics of both Greek and Roman religion.

We may here summarize the differences between Greek and Roman religion in H. G. Rose's own words:

"The Greeks were keen, original thinkers, bold experimenters, capable of breaking with their past, if they thought it advisable, to a far greater degree than most nations. They had, moreover, a gift for abstract thought, and a remarkably high proportion of them had logical minds and were ready to follow their own ideas to the uttermost consequences. Hence they developed a highly abstract, largely monotheistic theology and read it into the traditional practices of their ancestral religion, and many of their conclusions, passing little changed into Christianity, have coloured the whole of European thought on such matters ever since. But the Romans were a much slower-witted people. Orderly and legalistic, willing to learn but at the same time extraordinarily tenacious of the past, at all events in form, they neither struck out any new lines for themselves nor ever quite abandoned the old, half-savage practices which they had inherited from simple ancestors, peasants and herdsmen of prehistoric days. Their theology and philosophy, when they had such things at all, were simplified adaptations of Greek thought. Furthermore, the Greeks, the greatest artists of antiquity, had a vivid and pictorial imagination. The objects of their worship appeared to their mind's eye as clearly-defined figures, human in shape but glorious above the level of humanity, and as individual as any actual men or women." (Pp. 157-158)

These excellent observations are characteristic of the kind of analysis of ancient religion that H. J. Rose provides us with, only every generalization is backed up cogently, clearly, and vividly by specimens from the ancient evidence that we have at our disposal.

We cannot but recommend *Religion in Greece and Rome* with the greatest confidence and enthusiasm.

JOHN E. REXINE



Copyright and Use:

As an ATLAS user, you may print, download, or send articles for individual use according to fair use as defined by U.S. and international copyright law and as otherwise authorized under your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement.

No content may be copied or emailed to multiple sites or publicly posted without the copyright holder(s)' express written permission. Any use, decompiling, reproduction, or distribution of this journal in excess of fair use provisions may be a violation of copyright law.

This journal is made available to you through the ATLAS collection with permission from the copyright holder(s). The copyright holder for an entire issue of a journal typically is the journal owner, who also may own the copyright in each article. However, for certain articles, the author of the article may maintain the copyright in the article. Please contact the copyright holder(s) to request permission to use an article or specific work for any use not covered by the fair use provisions of the copyright laws or covered by your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement. For information regarding the copyright holder(s), please refer to the copyright information in the journal, if available, or contact ATLA to request contact information for the copyright holder(s).

About ATLAS:

The ATLA Serials (ATLAS®) collection contains electronic versions of previously published religion and theology journals reproduced with permission. The ATLAS collection is owned and managed by the American Theological Library Association (ATLA) and received initial funding from Lilly Endowment Inc.

The design and final form of this electronic document is the property of the American Theological Library Association.

scholarly yet pleasantly readable, clear and bold in its comparisons of affinities with contemporary philosophical and scientific trends, and persuasive in its reaffirmation of Plato's universality as a thinker. The titles of the eighteen chapters of the book show the range of the subjects examined: *Eidos, Demon and Eros; Beyond Being; The Academy; The Written Work; Socrates in Plato; Irony; Dialogue; Myth; Intuition and Construction (A Path to Bergson and Schopenhauer); Aletheia (A Discussion with Martin Heidegger); Dialogue and Existence (A Question Addressed to Karl Jaspers); Plato's Letters; Plato as Physicist (Structure and Destruction of the Atom According to Plato's *Timaeus*); Plato as Geographer (The Beginnings of Spherical Geography); Plato as Jurist (by Huntington Cairns); Plato as City Planner (The Ideal City of Atlantis); and Socrates Enters Rome.*

The detailed, annotated and thorough examination of these themes goes deeply into the origins, development, and growth of Platonic thought, and lucidly displays its working and accomplishments. Of special interest is the second part of the book which shows the impact of Plato on later philosophy, on modern thinkers in particular, even when they try to repudiate him. It must be said, however, that the general composition here is not so compact and strict as in Part I, perhaps because one of the essays, "Plato as Jurist," is written by another person, or perhaps because the modern aspects examined were too many and disconnected for a full, uninterrupted, juxtaposed comparison with Plato. The twelve illustrative figures in the text are very helpful in understanding Plato's opinions and achievements in geometry, geography, and city planning.

This book is a must for every serious student of Platonic philosophy.

COSTAS M. PROUSSIS

JOHN E. REXINE, *Religion in Plato and Cicero*. New York: Philosophical Library, 1959. Pp. 72. \$2.75.

This little volume by my young colleague and classical scholar, John E. Rexine, is both an interesting and helpful one, and as a comparative study and analysis of Plato's religious and theological views and thinking, as expressed in his *Laws*, and those of Cicero in his *Laws*, it sheds some needed light on a sometimes neglected area of study. Stressing the similarities and differences of both philosophers, the

author shows at the same time, and above all, the intrinsic variances in the religious thinking and practice underlying Hellenism and Romanism, the first tending toward the abstract and metaphysical, the second towards the more concrete and socio-legalistic.

The quotations from the works of both men are necessarily long and numerous and the author's analytical approach to and evaluation of these within the scope of his treatment is quite successful and illuminating. It is unfortunate, however, that the Greek text itself is not included, especially for purposes of consistency, insofar as the Latin is quoted without the aid of any English translation. The chapters entitled "The Theology of Book X of Plato's *Laws*" and "The Platonic Attitude toward Poetry" should be noted especially for their insight and merits. They contain some thoughtful and valuable observations on Plato's concern over religious heresies and the poet's supreme responsibility not to corrupt the citizen in matters of religion particularly through the media of art.

Indeed, in his chapter on Plato's attitude toward poetry, Mr. Rexine clearly shows the position of the poet as seen by Plato, that is, the poet must uphold and defend tradition, morals, religiosity; he must not be arrogant and aesthetically defiant and irresponsible; his task as an artist should be motivated by and in conformity with educative and conformist preoccupations. The author does not fail to point out that under Plato's thought the poet must agree to censorship, to supervision, since he is merely "tolerated" by the lawgiver, who is always superior in his role and importance. Mr. Rexine fails to take a stand here, one way or another, but this reviewer must note his own views that in this respect Plato very nearly borders on totalitarian concepts that stifle the genuine flow and truth of art — the kind of concept that did tremendous harm when utilized not too long ago in Fascist and Nazi ideologies; and that the severe punishment of the three kinds of heresies in religion — by imprisonment and death — that Plato contemplates call to mind the horrors of the Inquisition, although Plato had no experience of a persecuting religion and could not foresee the abuses to which such a system is open.

Mr. Rexine succinctly sums up the religious views of both figures in their religious advice to man and his state as follows: "Both in Plato and in Cicero religion is necessary and important for the stability of the state. Plato tends to be very severe in the matter of violations of the established religion; Cicero insists upon the kinship of man with the gods could be very useful, in fact have been very useful, if they are properly respected, in the manner of their forefathers. Plato is natu-

rally much more metaphysical and idealistic; Cicero hearkens back to his Roman ancestors and the historical greatness of the Roman state." (p. 52)

Religion in Plato and Cicero, finally, is always well documented and carefully organized (although a general bibliography, always helpful, is lacking). Of course, as it stands now, this is only a small treatise that should be expanded in the future. And certainly, on the basis of what we have here, I am sure that Mr. Rexine's future work will be awaited by his readers.

JOHN E. GEORGE

PLUTARCH, *Moralia*. Vol. VII: 523C-612B. With an English Translation by Phillip H. De Lacy and Benedict Einarson. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1959. Pp. xvi. and 618. \$3.00.

The seventh volume of Plutarch's *Moralia* in the Loeb Classical Library, containing the nine treatises of 523C-612B, is here edited with an English translation by Professors De Lacy and Einarson of the Washington University and the University of Chicago respectively. The Greek text is given in a new critical edition resting "on a collation from photostats of all MSS. known to" the editors and on the comparison of earlier editions and translations. Thus, besides its wholesome text this volume is enriched with a rather detailed and full *apparatus criticus*, an advantage over most of the editions of the Loeb series which, according to their serviceable character, usually have only summarized and elementary *apparati critici*. To this one must also add the many useful explanatory footnotes which throw light upon obscure passages and give ample reference to and information from the relevant bibliography, ancient and modern. Of special interest are the introductions to each of the nine treatises, where not only a brief analysis of each treatise is presented but also there is a discussion about the probable time of its composition, about its spirit and its relation to or differences from other works of Plutarch or the works of other writers. The treatises contained in this volume are the following: "On Love of Wealth," "On Compliancy," "On Envy and Hate," "On Praising Oneself Inoffensively," "On the Delays of the Divine Vengeance," "On Fate," "On the Sign of Socrates," "On Exile," and "Consolation to his Wife." The English translation is close enough to the Greek text so that one may call it literal, but also free enough to be read



Copyright and Use:

As an ATLAS user, you may print, download, or send articles for individual use according to fair use as defined by U.S. and international copyright law and as otherwise authorized under your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement.

No content may be copied or emailed to multiple sites or publicly posted without the copyright holder(s)' express written permission. Any use, decompiling, reproduction, or distribution of this journal in excess of fair use provisions may be a violation of copyright law.

This journal is made available to you through the ATLAS collection with permission from the copyright holder(s). The copyright holder for an entire issue of a journal typically is the journal owner, who also may own the copyright in each article. However, for certain articles, the author of the article may maintain the copyright in the article. Please contact the copyright holder(s) to request permission to use an article or specific work for any use not covered by the fair use provisions of the copyright laws or covered by your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement. For information regarding the copyright holder(s), please refer to the copyright information in the journal, if available, or contact ATLA to request contact information for the copyright holder(s).

About ATLAS:

The ATLA Serials (ATLAS®) collection contains electronic versions of previously published religion and theology journals reproduced with permission. The ATLAS collection is owned and managed by the American Theological Library Association (ATLA) and received initial funding from Lilly Endowment Inc.

The design and final form of this electronic document is the property of the American Theological Library Association.

SAINT GREGORY PALAMAS AND THE TRADITION OF THE FATHERS*

By THE VERY REV. GEORGES FLOROVSKY

I

“Following the Holy Fathers” . . . It was usual in the Ancient Church to introduce doctrinal statements by phrases like this. The Decree of Chalcedon opens precisely with these very words. The Seventh Ecumenical Council introduces its decision concerning the Holy Icons in a more elaborate way: *“Following the Divinely inspired teaching of the Holy Fathers and the Tradition of the Catholic Church.”* The *didaskalia* of the Fathers is the formal and normative term of reference.

Now, this was much more than just an “appeal to antiquity.” Indeed, the Church always stresses the permanence of her faith through the ages, from the very beginning. This identity, since the Apostolic times, is the most conspicuous sign and token of right faith — always the same. In the famous phrase of Vincent of Lerins, *in ipsa item catholicica ecclesia magnopere curandum est ut id teneamus quod ubique, quod semper, quod ab omnibus creditum est* (*Commonitorium*, cap. 2.3). The Church holds fast to what has been always believed, everywhere and by all. Yet, “antiquity” by itself is not an adequate proof of the true faith. Moreover, the Christian message was obviously a striking “novelty” for the “ancient world,” and, indeed, a call to radical “renovation.” The “Old” has passed away, and everything has been “made New.” On the other hand, heresies could also appeal to the past and invoke the authority of certain “traditions.” In fact, heresies were often lingering in the past.¹ Archaic formulas can often be dangerously misleading. Vincent of Lerins himself was fully aware

* A lecture delivered at Thessalonike, Greece, on the occasion of the 600th anniversary of the Dormition of St. Gregory Palamas, at which time the University of Salonika conferred upon the author an honorary doctorate in theology.

¹ It has been recently suggested that Gnostics were actually the first to invoke formally the authority of an “Apostolic Tradition” and that it was their usage which moved St. Irenaeus to elaborate his own conception of Tradition. D. B. Reynders, “Paradosis: Le progrès de l’idée de tradition jusqu’à Saint Irenée,” in *Recherches de Théologie ancienne et médiévale*, V (1933), Louvain, pp. 155-191. In any case, Gnostics used to refer to “tradition.”

of this danger. It would suffice to quote this pathetic passage of his: "And now, what an amazing reversal of the situation! The authors of the same opinion are adjudged to be catholics, but the followers — heretics; the masters are absolved, the disciples are condemned; the writers of the books will be children of the Kingdom, their followers will go to Gehenna" — *Et o mira rerum conversio! Auctores ejusdem opinionis catholici, consecratores vero haeretici judicantur: absolvuntur magistri, condemnantur discipuli; conscriptores librorum filii regni erunt, assertores vero gehenna suscipiet* (*Commonitorium*, cap. 6). Vincent had in mind, of course, St. Cyprian and the Donatists. St. Cyprian himself was facing the same situation. "Antiquity" as such may happen to be just an inveterate prejudice: *nam antiquitas sine veritate vetustas erroris est* (*Epist. 74*). And again: *Dominus, Ego sum, inquit, veritas. Non dixit, Ego sum consuetudo* (*Sententiae epis coporum numero 87*, cap. 30). It is to say — "old customs" as such do not guarantee the truth. "Truth" is not just a "habit."

The true tradition is only the tradition of truth, *traditio veritatis*. This tradition, according to St. Irenaeus, is grounded in, and secured by, that *charisma veritatis certum*, which has been "deposited" in the Church from the very beginning and has been preserved by the uninterrupted succession of episcopal ministry: *qui cum episcopatus successione charisma veritatis certum acceperunt* (*Adv. haereses. IV.40.2*). "Tradition" in the Church is not a continuity of human memory, or a permanence of rites and habits. It is a living tradition — *depositum juvenescens*, in the phrase of St. Irenaeus. Accordingly, it cannot be counted *inter mortuas regulas*. Ultimately, tradition is a continuity of the abiding presence of the Holy Spirit in the Church, a continuity of Divine guidance and illumination. The Church is not bound by the "letter." Rather, she is constantly moved forth by the "spirit." The same Spirit, the Spirit of Truth, which "spake through the Phophts," which guided the Apostles, is still continuously guiding the Church into the fuller comprehension and understanding of the Divine truth, from glory to glory.

"*Following the Holy Fathers*" . . . This is not a reference to some abstract tradition, in formulas and propositions. It is primarily an appeal to holy witnesses. Indeed, we appeal to the Apostles, and not just to an abstract "Apostolicity." In the similar manner do we refer to the Fathers. The witness of the Fathers belongs, intrinsically and integrally, to the very structure of Orthodox belief. The Church is equally committed to the *kerygma* of the Apostles and to the *dogma* of the Fathers. We may quote at this point an admirable ancient hymn (probably, from the pen of St. Romanus the Melode). "Preserving

the kerygma of the Apostles and the dogmas of the Fathers, the Church has sealed the one faith and wearing the tunic of truth she shapes rightly the brocade of heavenly theology and praises the great mystery of piety.”²

The Church is “Apostolic” indeed. But the Church is also “Patristic.” She is intrinsically “the Church of the Fathers.” These two “notes” cannot be separated. Only by being “Patristic” is the Church truly “Apostolic.” The witness of the Fathers is much more than simply a historic feature, a voice from the past. Let us quote another hymn — from the office of the Three Hierarchs. “By the word of knowledge you have composed the dogmas which the fishermen have established first in simple words, in knowledge by the power of the Spirit, for thus our simple piety had to acquire composition” — Τῷ ιόγῳ τῆς γνώσεως συνιστάται τὰ δόγματα, ἀ τὸ πρὸν ἐν λόγοις ἀπλοῖς κατεβάλλοντο ἀλιεῖς ἐν γνώσει δυνάμει τοῦ Πνεύματος, ἔδει γὰρ καὶ οὕτω τὸ ἀπλοῦν ἡμῶν σέβας τὴν σύστασιν κτήσασται. There are, as it were, two basic stages in the proclamation of the Christian faith. “Our simple faith had to acquire composition.” There was an inner urge, an inner logic, an internal necessity, in this transition — from *kerygma* to *dogma*. Indeed, the teaching of the Fathers, and the dogma of the Church, are still the same “simple message” which has been once delivered and deposited, once for ever, by the Apostles. But now it is, as it were, properly and fully articulated. The Apostolic preaching is kept alive in the Church, not only merely preserved. In this sense, the teaching of the Fathers is a permanent category of Christian existence, a constant and ultimate measure and criterion of right faith. Fathers are not only witnesses of the old faith, *testes antiquitatis*. They are rather witnesses of the true faith, *testes veritatis*. “The mind of the Fathers” is an intrinsic term of reference in Orthodox theology, no less than the word of the Holy Writ, and indeed never separated from it. As it has been well said recently, “the Catholic Church of all ages is not merely a daughter of the Church of the Fathers, — *she is and remains the Church of the Fathers*.³”

The main distinctive mark of Patristic theology was its “existential” character, if we may use this current neologism. The Fathers theologized, as St. Gregory of Nazianzus put it, “in the manner of the

² Paul Maas, ed., *Frühbyzantinische Kirchenpoesie*, I, Bonn, 1910, s. 24.

³ Louis Bouyer, “Le renouveau des études patristiques,” in *La Vie Intellectuelle*, XV, Fevrier 1947, p. 18: “L’Eglise catholique de tous les temps n’est pas seulement la fille de l’Eglise des Peres, mais elle est et demeure l’Eglise des Peres.”

Apostles, not in that of Aristotle" — ἀλιευτικῶς, οὐκ ἀριστοτελικῶς, (*Hom.* 23.12). Their theology was still a "message," a *κειγμα*. Their theology was still "kerygmatic theology," even if it was often logically arranged and supplied with intellectual arguments. The ultimate reference was there still to the vision of faith, to spiritual knowledge and experience. Apart from life in Christ theology carries no conviction and, if separated from the life of faith, theology may degenerate into empty dialectics, a vain *polylogia*, without any spiritual consequence. Patristic theology was existentially rooted in the decisive commitment of faith. It was not a self-explanatory "discipline" which could be presented argumentatively, that is ἀριστοτελικῶς, without any prior spiritual engagement. In the age of theological strife and incessant debates, the great Cappadocian Fathers formally protested against the use of dialectics, of "Aristotelian syllogisms," and endeavored to refer theology back to the vision of faith. Patristic theology could be only "preached" or "proclaimed" — preached from the pulpit, proclaimed also in the words of prayer and in the sacred rites, and indeed manifested in the total structure of Christian life. Theology of this kind can never be separated from the life of prayer and from the exercise of virtue. "The climax of purity is the beginning of theology," as St. John the Klimakos puts it: Τέλος δὲ ἀγνείας ὑπόθεσις θεολογίας (*Scala Paradisi*, grade 30).

On the other hand, theology of this type is always, as it were, "pro-paideutic," since its ultimate aim and purpose is to ascertain and to acknowledge the Mystery of the Living God, and indeed to bear witness to it, in word and deed. "Theology" is not an end in itself. It is always but a way. Theology, and even the "dogmas," present no more than an "intellectual contour" of the revealed truth, and a "noetic" testimony to it. Only in the act of faith is this "contour" filled with content. Christological formulas are fully meaningful only for those who have encountered the Living Christ, and have received and acknowledged Him as God and Saviour, and are dwelling by faith in Him, in His body, the Church. In this sense, theology is never a self-explanatory discipline. It is constantly appealing to the vision of faith. "What we have seen and have heard we announce to you." Apart from this "announcement" theological formulas are empty and of no consequence. For the same reason these formulas can never be taken "abstractly," that is, out of total context of belief. It is misleading to single out particular statements of the Fathers and to detach them from the total perspective in which they have been actually uttered, just as it is misleading to manipulate with detached quotations from the Scripture. It is a dangerous habit "to quote" the Fathers, that is, their isolated sayings and phrases, outside of that concrete setting in

which only they have their full and proper meaning and are truly alive. "To follow" the Fathers does not mean just "to quote" them. "To follow" the Fathers means to acquire their "mind," their *phronema*.

Now, we have reached the crucial point. The name of "Church Fathers" is usually restricted to *the teachers of the Ancient Church*. And it is currently assumed that their authority depends upon their "antiquity," upon their comparative nearness to the "Primitive Church," to the initial "Age" of the Church. Already St. Jerome had to contest this idea. Indeed, there was no decrease of "authority," and no decrease in the immediacy of spiritual competence and knowledge, in the course of Christian history. In fact, however, this idea of "decrease" has strongly affected our modern theological thinking. In fact, it is too often assumed, consciously or unconsciously, that the Early Church was, as it were, closer to the spring of truth. As an admission of our own failure and inadequacy, as an act of humble self-criticism, such an assumption is sound and helpful. But it is dangerous to make of it the starting point or basis of our "theology of Church history," or even of our theology of the Church. Indeed, the Age of the Apostles should retain its unique position. Yet, it was just a beginning. It is widely assumed that the "Age of the Fathers" has also ended, and accordingly it is regarded just as an ancient formation, "antiquated" in a sense and "archaic." The limit of the "Patristic Age" is variously defined. It is usual to regard St. John of Damascus as the "last Father" in the East, and St. Gregory the Dialogos or Isidore of Seville as "the last" in the West. This periodization has been justly contested in recent times. Should not, for instance, St. Theodore of Studium, at least, be included among "the Fathers"? Already Mabillon suggested that Bernard of Clairvaux, the Doctor mellifluous, was "the last of the Fathers, and surely not unequal to the earlier ones."⁴ Actually, it is more than a question of periodization. From the Western point of view "the Age of the Fathers" has been succeeded, and indeed superseded, by "the Age of the Schoolmen," which was an essential step forward. Since the rise of Scholasticism "Patristic theology" has been antiquated, has become actually a "past age," a kind of archaic prelude. This point of view, legitimate for the West, has been, most unfortunately, accepted also by many in the East, blindly and uncritically. Accordingly, one has to face the alternative. *Either* one has to regret the "backwardness" of the East which never developed any "Scholasticism" of its own. *Or* one should retire into the "Ancient Age," in a more or

⁴ Mabillon, *Bernardi Opera, Praefatio generalis*, n. 23, Migne, P. L., CLXXXII, c. 26.

less archeological manner, and practice what has been wittily described recently as a "theology of repetition." The latter, in fact, is just a peculiar form of imitative "scholasticism."

Now, it is not seldom suggested that, probably, "the Age of the Fathers" has ended much earlier than St. John of Damascus. Very often one does not proceed further than the Age of Justinian, or even already the Council of Chalcedon. Was not Leontius of Byzantium already "the first of the Scholastics"? Psychologically, this attitude is quite comprehensible, although it cannot be theologically justified. Indeed, the Fathers of the Fourth century are much more impressive, and their unique greatness cannot be denied. Yet, the Church remained fully alive also after Nicea and Chalcedon. The current overemphasis on the "first five centuries" dangerously distorts theological vision, and prevents the right understanding of the Chalcedonian dogma itself. The decree of the Sixth Ecumenical Council is often regarded as a kind of an "appendix" to Chalcedon, interesting only for theological specialists, and the great figure of St. Maximus the Confessor is almost completely ignored. Accordingly, the theological significance of the Seventh Ecumenical Council is dangerously obscured, and one is left to wonder, why the Feast of Orthodoxy should be related to the commemoration of Church's victory over the Iconoclasts. Was it not just a "ritualistic controversy"? We often forget that the famous formula of the *Consensus quinquesaecularis*, that is, actually, up to Chalcedon, was a Protestant formula, and reflected a peculiar Protestant "theology of history." It was a *restrictive* formula, as much as it seemed to be too inclusive to those who wanted to be secluded in the Apostolic Age. The point is, however, that the current Eastern formula of "the Seven Ecumenical Councils" is hardly much better, if it tends, as it usually does, to *restrict* or to limit the Church's spiritual authority to the first eight centuries, as if "the Golden Age" of Christianity has already passed and we are now, probably, already in an Iron Age, much lower on the scale of spiritual vigor and authority. Our theological thinking has been dangerously affected by the *pattern of decay*, adopted for the interpretation of Christian history in the West since the Reformation. The fullness of the Church was then interpreted in a static manner, and the attitude to Antiquity has been accordingly distorted and misconstrued. After all, it does not make much difference, whether we *restrict* the normative authority of the Church to one century, or to five, or to eight. *There should be no restriction at all.* Consequently, there is no room for any "theology of repetition." The Church is still fully authoritative as she has been in the ages past, since the Spirit of Truth quickens her now no less effectively as in the ancient times.

One of the immediate results of our careless periodization is that we simply ignore the legacy of Byzantine theology. We are prepared, now more than only a few decades ago, to admit the perennial authority of "the Fathers," especially since the revival of Patristic studies in the West. But we still tend to limit the scope of admission, and obviously "Byzantine theologians" are not readily counted among the "Fathers." We are inclined to discriminate rather rigidly between "Patristics" — in a more or less narrow sense — and "Byzantinism." We are still inclined to regard "Byzantinism" as an inferior sequel to the Patristic Age. We have still doubts about its normative relevance for theological thinking. Now, Byzantine theology was much more than just a "repetition" of Patristic theology, nor was that which was new in it of an inferior quality in comparison with "Christian Antiquity." Indeed, Byzantine theology was an organic continuation of the Patristic Age. Was there any break? Has the *ethos* of the Eastern Orthodox Church been ever changed, at a certain historic point or date, which, however, has never been unanimously identified, so that the "later" development was of lesser authority and importance, if of any? This admission seems to be silently implied in the *restrictive* commitment to the *Seven Ecumenical Councils*. Then, St. Symeon the New Theologian and St. Gregory Palamas are simply left out, and the great Hesychast Councils of the Fourteenth century are ignored and forgotten. What is their position and authority in the Church?

Now, in fact, St. Symeon and St. Gregory are still authoritative masters and inspirers of all those who, in the Orthodox Church, are striving after perfection, and are living the life of prayer and contemplation, whether in the surviving monastic communities, or in the solitude of the desert, and even in the world. These faithful people are not aware of any alleged "break" between "Patristics" and "Byzantinism." The *Philokalia*, this great encyclopaedia of Eastern piety, which includes writings of many centuries, is, in our own days, increasingly becoming the manual of guidance and instruction for all those who are eager to *practice Orthodoxy* in our contemporary situation. The authority of its compiler, St. Nicodemus of the Holy Mount, has been recently recognized and enhanced by his formal canonization in the Church. In this sense, we are bound to say, "the Age of the Fathers" still continues in "the Worshipping Church." Should it not continue also in our theological pursuit and study, research and instruction? Should we not recover "the mind of the Fathers" also in our theological thinking and teaching? To recover it, indeed, not as an archaic manner or pose, and not just as a venerable relic, but as an existential attitude, as a spiritual orientation. Only in this way can our theology be reintegrated into the fullness of our Christian existence.

It is not enough to keep a "Byzantine liturgy," as we do, to *restore* Byzantine iconography and Byzantine music, as we are still *reluctant* to do consistently, and to practice certain Byzantine modes of *devotion*. One has to go to the very roots of this traditional "piety," and to *recover* the "Patristic mind." Otherwise we may be in danger of *being* inwardly split—as many in our midst actually are—between *the* "traditional" forms of "piety" and a very untraditional habit of *theological* thinking. It is a real danger. As "worshipers" we are still *in* "the tradition of the Fathers." Should we not stand, conscientiously and avowedly, in the same tradition also as "theologians," as *witnesses* and teachers of Orthodoxy? Can we retain our integrity in *any* other way?

II

All these preliminary considerations are highly relevant for *our* immediate purpose. We are gathered here in these days to commemorate St. Gregory Palamas. What is his theological legacy? St. Gregory was not a speculative theologian. He was a monk and a bishop. *He* was not concerned about abstract problems of philosophy, although *he* was well trained in this field too. He was concerned solely with problems of Christian existence. As a theologian, he was simply an interpreter of the spiritual experience of the Church. Almost all his writings, except probably his homilies, were occasional writings. He was *wrestling* with the problems of his own time. And it was a critical time, an age of controversy and anxiety. Indeed, it was also an age of spiritual renewal.

St. Gregory was suspected of subversive innovations by his enemies in his own time. This charge is still maintained against him in *the* West. In fact, however, St. Gregory was deeply rooted in the tradition. It is not difficult to trace most of his views and motives back to the Cappadocian Fathers and to St. Maximus the Confessor, who *was*, by the way, one of the most popular masters of Byzantine thought *and* devotion. Indeed, St. Gregory was also intimately acquainted with the writings of Pseudo-Dionysius. He was rooted in the tradition. Yet, in no sense was his theology just a "theology of repetition." It was a creative extension of ancient tradition. Its starting point *was* Life in Christ.

Of all themes of St. Gregory's theology let us single out but *one*, the crucial one, and the most controversial. What is the basic character of Christian existence? The ultimate aim and purpose of human life was defined in the Patristic tradition as *θέωσις*. The term is rather *offensive* for the modern ear. It cannot be adequately rendered in *any*

modern language, nor even in Latin. Even in Greek it is rather heavy and pretentious. Indeed, it is a daring word. The meaning of the word is, however, simple and lucid. It was one of the crucial terms in the Patristic vocabulary. It would suffice to quote at this point but St. Athanasius. Γέγονεν γὰρ ἀνθρωπος, ἵν' ἡμᾶς ἐν ἔσωτῷ θεοποιήσῃ (*Ad Adelphium* 4). Αὐτὸς γὰρ ἐνηρθρώσεν, ἵνα ἡμεῖς θεοποιηθῶμεν (*De Incarnatione* 54). St. Athanasius actually resumes here the favorite idea of St. Irenaeus: *qui propter immensam dilectionem suam factus est quod sumus nos, uti nos perficeret esse quod est ipse* (*Adv. Haeres.* V, *Praefatio*). It was the common conviction of the Greek Fathers. One can quote at length St. Gregory of Nazianzus, St. Gregory of Nyssa, St. Cyril of Alexandria, St. Maximus, and indeed St. Symeon the New Theologian. Man ever remains what he is, that is — creature. But he is promised and granted, in Christ Jesus, the Word made man, an intimate sharing in what is Divine: Life Everlasting and incorruptible. The main characteristic of *theosis* is, according to the Fathers, precisely "immortality" or "incorruption." For God alone "has immortality" — ὁ μόνος ἔχων ἀθανασίαν (I Tim. 6.16). But man now is admitted into an intimate "communion" with God, through Christ and by the power of the Holy Spirit. And this is much more than just a "moral" communion, and much more than just a human perfection. Only the word *theosis* can render adequately the uniqueness of the promise and offer. The term *theosis* is indeed quite embarrassing, if we would think in "ontological" categories. Indeed, man simply cannot "become" god. But the Fathers were thinking in "personal" terms, and the mystery of *personal* communion was involved at this point. *Theosis* meant a personal encounter. It is that intimate intercourse of man with God, in which the whole of human existence is, as it were, permeated by the Divine Presence.⁵

Yet, the problem remains: How can even this intercourse be compatible with the Divine Transcendence? And this is the crucial point. Does man really encounter God, in this present life on earth? Does man encounter God, truly and verily, in his present life of prayer? Or, is there no more than an *actio in distans*? The common claim of the Eastern Fathers was that in his devotional ascent man actually encounters God and beholds His eternal Glory. Now, how is it possible, if God "abides in the light unapproachable"? The paradox was especially sharp in the Eastern theology, which has been always com-

⁵ Cf. M. Lot-Borodine, "La doctrine de la 'deification' dans l'Eglise grecque jusqu'au XI^e siècle," in *Revue de l'histoire des religions*, tome CV, Nr 1, Janvier-Fevrier 1932, pp. 5-43; tome CVI, Nr 2/3, Septembre-Decembre 1932, pp. 525-574; tome VCII, Nr I, Janvier-Fevrier 1933, pp. 8-55.

mitted to the belief that God was absolutely "incomprehensible" — ἀκατάληπτος — and unknowable in His nature or essence. This conviction was powerfully expressed by the Cappadocian Fathers, especially in their struggle against Eunomius, and also by St. John Chrysostom, in his magnificent discourses Περὶ Ἀκαταλήπτου. Thus, if God is absolutely "unapproachable" in His essence, and accordingly His essence simply cannot be "communicated," how can *theosis* be possible at all? "One insults God who seeks to apprehend His essential being," says Chrysostom. Already in St. Athanasius we find a clear distinction between God's very "essence" and His powers and bounty: Καὶ ἐν πᾶσι μὲν ἔστι κατὰ τὴν ἑαυτοῦ ἀγαθότητα, ἔξω δὲ τῶν πάντων πάλιν ἔστι κατὰ τὴν ἴδιαν φύσιν (*De Decretis* 11). The same conception was carefully elaborated by the Cappadocians. The "essence of God" is absolutely inaccessible to man, says St. Basil: Ἀπερινότητος ἀνθρώπου φύσει καὶ ἀρροτος παντελῶς η̄ οὐσία τοῦ Θεοῦ (*Adv. Eunomium* 1.14). We know God only in His actions, and by His actions: Ἡμεῖς δὲ ἐξ μὲν τῶν ἐνεργειῶν γνωρίζειν λέγομεν τὸν Θεὸν ἡμῶν, τῇ δὲ οὐσίᾳ προσεγγίζειν οὐκ ὑπισχνούμεθα: αἱ μὲν γὰρ ἐνέργειαι αὐτοῦ πρὸς ἡμᾶς καταβαίνουσιν, η̄ δὲ οὐσία αὐτοῦ μένει ἀπρόσιτος (*Epist. 234, ad Amphilochium*). Yet, it is a true knowledge, not just a conjecture or deduction: αἱ ἐνέργειαι αὐτοῦ πρὸς ἡμᾶς καταβαίνουσιν. In the phrase of St. John of Damascus, these actions or "energies" of God are the true revelation of God Himself: η̄ θεία ἔλλαμψις καὶ ἐνέργεια (*De Fide Orth.* 1.14). It is a *real presence*, and not merely a certain *praesentia operativa, sicut agens adest ei in quod agit*. This mysterious mode of Divine Presence, in spite of the absolute transcendence of the Divine Essence, passes all understanding. But it is no less certain for that reason.

St. Gregory Palamas stands in an ancient tradition at this point. In His "energies" the Unapproachable God mysteriously approaches man. And this Divine move effects encounter: πρόσοδος εἰς τὰ ἔξω, in the phrase of St. Maximus (*Scholia in De Div. Nom.*, 1.5).

St. Gregory begins with the distinction between "grace" and "substance": η̄ θεία καὶ θεοποίος ἔλλαμψις καὶ χάρις οὐκ οὐσία, ὅλη ἐνέργεια ἔστι Θεοῦ (*Capita Phys., Theol., etc.*, 68-69). This basic distinction has been formally accepted and elaborated at the Great Councils in Constantinople, 1341 and 1351. Those who would deny this distinction were anathematized and excommunicated. The anathematisms of the council of 1351 were included in the rite for the Sunday of Orthodoxy, in the Triodion. Orthodox theologians are bound by this decision. The essence of God is absolutely ἀμεθεκτή. The source and the power of human *theosis* is not the Divine essence, but the "Grace of

God θεοποιος ἐνεργεια, ἵσ τὰ μετεχοντα θεοῦνται, θεία τις ἔστι χάρις, ἀλλ' οὐχ ἡ φύσις τοῦ Θεοῦ (*ibid.* 92-93) Λάρις is not identical with the οὐσία It is θεία καὶ ἀποιτοσ χάρις καὶ ἐνεργεια (*ibid.*, 69) This distinction, however, does not imply or effect division or separation Nor is it just an "accident," οὐτε συμβεβηρότος (*ibid.*, 127) Energies 'proceed' from God and manifest His own Being The term προιεναι simply suggests διαρροισιν, but not a division εἰ ναὶ διενήνοχε τῆς φύσεως, οὐ διαστᾶται ἡ τοῦ Πνεύματος χάρις (*Theophanes*, p 940)

Actually the whole teaching of St Gregory presupposes the action of the Personal God God moves toward man and embraces him by His own "grace" and action, without leaving that φῶς ἀπόστοτον, in which He eternally abides The ultimate purpose of St Gregory's theological teaching was to defend the reality of Christian experience Salvation is more than forgiveness It is a genuine renewal of man And this renewal is effected not by the discharge, or release, of certain natural energies implied in man's own creaturely being, but by the energies 'of God Himself, who thereby encounters and encompasses man, and admits him into communion with Himself In fact, the teaching of St Gregory affects the whole system of theology, the whole body of Christian doctrine It starts with the clear distinction between "nature" and "will" of God This distinction was also characteristic of the Eastern tradition, at least since St Athanasius It may be asked at this point Is this distinction compatible with the "simplicity" of God? Should we not rather regard all these distinctions as merely logical conjectures, necessary for us, but ultimately without any ontological significance? As a matter of fact, St Gregory Palamas was attacked by his opponents precisely from that point of view God's Being is simple, and in Him even all attributes coincide Already St Augustine diverged at this point from the Eastern tradition Under Augustinian presuppositions the teaching of St Gregory is unacceptable and absurd St Gregory himself anticipated the width of implications of his basic distinction If one does not accept it, he argued, then it would be impossible to discern clearly between the "generation" of the Son and "creation" of the world, both being the acts of substance, and this would lead to utter confusion in the Trinitarian doctrine St Gregory was quite formal at that point

If according to the delirious opponents and those who agree with them, the Divine energy in no way differs from the Divine essence, then the act of creating, which belongs to the will, will in no way differ from generation (γεννᾶν) and procession (ἐπορεύειν), which belong to the essence If to create is no different from generation and procession, then the creatures will in no way differ from the Begotten

(γεννήματος) and the Projected (προβλήματος). If such is the case according to them, then both the Son of God and the Holy Spirit will be no different from creatures, and the creatures will all be both the begotten (γεννήματα) and the projected (προβλήματα) of God the Father, and creation will be deified and God will be arrayed with the creatures. For this reason the venerable Cyril, showing the difference between God's essence and energy, says that to generate belongs to the Divine nature, whereas to create belongs to His Divine energy. This he shows clearly saying, 'nature and energy are not the same.' If the Divine essence in no way differs from the Divine energy, then to beget (γεννᾶν) and to project (ἐκπορεύειν) will in no way differ from creating (ποιεῖν). God the Father creates by the Son and in the Holy Spirit. Thus He also begets and projects by the Son and in the Holy Spirit, according to the opinion of the opponents and those who agree with them." (*Capita* 96 and 97).

St. Gregory quotes St. Cyril of Alexandria. But St. Cyril at this point was simply repeating St. Athanasius. St. Athanasius, in his refutation of Arianism, formally stressed the ultimate difference between οὐσία (or φύσις), on the one hand, and the βούλησις, on the other. God exists, and then He also acts. There is a certain "necessity" in the Divine Being, indeed not a necessity of compulsion, and no *fatum*, but a necessity of being itself. God simply is what He is. But God's will is eminently free. He in no sense is necessitated to do what He does. Thus γέννησις is always κατὰ φύσιν, but creation is a βούλήσεως ἔργον (*Contra Arianos* III.64-66). These two dimensions, that of being and that of acting, are different, and must be clearly distinguished. Of course, this distinction in no way compromises the "Divine simplicity." Yet, it is a real distinction, and not just a logical device. St. Gregory was fully aware of the crucial importance of this distinction. At this point he was a true successor of the great Athanasius and of the Capadocian hierarchs.⁶

It has been recently suggested that the theology of St. Gregory should be described in modern terms as an "existentialist theology." Indeed, it differed radically from those modern conceptions which are currently denoted by this label. Yet, in any case, St. Gregory was definitely opposed to all kinds of "essentialist theologies" which fail to

⁶ Cf. my article: "The Concept of Creation in Saint Athanasius," to appear shortly in *The Acts of the Third Conference on Patristic Studies*, held at Oxford in September, 1959, as well as my earlier study: "The Idea of Creation in Christian Philosophy," in the *Eastern Churches Quarterly*, Vol. VIII, 1949, Supplementary issue: "Nature and Grace."

account for God's freedom, for the dynamism of God's will, for the reality of Divine action. St. Gregory would trace this trend back to Origen. It was the predicament of the Greek impersonalist metaphysics. If there is any room for Christian metaphysics at all, it must be a metaphysics of persons. The starting point of St. Gregory's theology was *the history of salvation*: on the larger scale, the Biblical story, which consisted of Divine acts, culminating in the Incarnation of the Word and His glorification through the Cross and Resurrection; on the smaller scale, the story of the Christian man, striving after perfection, and ascending step by step, till he encounters God in the vision of His glory. It was usual to describe the theology of St. Irenaeus as a "theology of facts." With no lesser justification we may describe also the theology of St. Gregory Palamas as a "theology of facts."

In our own time, we are coming more and more to the conviction that "theology of facts" is the only sound Orthodox theology. It is Biblical. It is Patristic. It is in complete conformity with the mind of the Church.

In this connection we may regard St. Gregory Palamas as our guide and teacher, in our endeavor to theologize from the heart of the Church.

HARVARD DIVINITY SCHOOL.



Copyright and Use:

As an ATLAS user, you may print, download, or send articles for individual use according to fair use as defined by U.S. and international copyright law and as otherwise authorized under your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement.

No content may be copied or emailed to multiple sites or publicly posted without the copyright holder(s)' express written permission. Any use, decompiling, reproduction, or distribution of this journal in excess of fair use provisions may be a violation of copyright law.

This journal is made available to you through the ATLAS collection with permission from the copyright holder(s). The copyright holder for an entire issue of a journal typically is the journal owner, who also may own the copyright in each article. However, for certain articles, the author of the article may maintain the copyright in the article. Please contact the copyright holder(s) to request permission to use an article or specific work for any use not covered by the fair use provisions of the copyright laws or covered by your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement. For information regarding the copyright holder(s), please refer to the copyright information in the journal, if available, or contact ATLA to request contact information for the copyright holder(s).

About ATLAS:

The ATLA Serials (ATLAS®) collection contains electronic versions of previously published religion and theology journals reproduced with permission. The ATLAS collection is owned and managed by the American Theological Library Association (ATLA) and received initial funding from Lilly Endowment Inc.

The design and final form of this electronic document is the property of the American Theological Library Association.

the approach to them by seeking them just through "science" or just through "religion"? This is what the authors imply by the spirit of their book. And their point is very well made as they show through plenty of clinical examples the success made by the cooperative teamwork of psychiatry and religion in meeting and solving everyday problems.

Linn and Schwarz, themselves well-trained in the art of counseling, reveal deep insight into the cause and solution of many human problems. Whether they are speaking of problems in sex and marriage or those in adolescence or those in bereavement they display masterful and skillful interpretations and illustrate whatever they say with case histories.

One conceivable criticism of *Psychiatry and Religious Experience* is the fact that no discrimination is made in the type of religious experience or religious leader being referred to. Yet this makes a book of this nature flexible where it might have been rigid; useful to many where it might have had very little appeal to as many groups as it does had it been more specific.

No book that deals with as many problems as does Linn and Schwarz's could really treat each one thoroughly. Volumes have been devoted to any one of the topics included therein. Yet the concisely dealt with subjects are handled adequately enough to make this a good textbook in the field of pastoral psychology. An excellent bibliography of both psychological and religious classics at the end of the book offers a satisfying supplement to each chapter. Surely, *Psychiatry and Religious Experience* will serve as a wonderful guide in counseling in the library of every clergyman.

ALEXANDER VERONIS

HENRY J. CADBURY, *The Book of Acts in History*. London: A. & C. Black, 1955. Pp. 170.

In this book, an eminent professor emeritus of Harvard University brings to focus the epoch in which the Christian Church was established. It is an attempt to present the circumstances, the intellectual and cultural climate in which the apostles and mainly the Apostle Paul worked for the realization of the Kingdom of God upon the earth. It discusses customs, traditions, legends, and philosophical trends as they become evident through the Book of Acts. This "earliest little essay of Church history is one of the most interesting and important narratives ever written," the author declares. It is a continuous account

of the Christian movement by a medical doctor who is also the *author* of the Third Gospel.

Cadbury divides his book into five chapters, each one dealing with subjects related to the Christian beginnings. In the first he presents in a general way the place that the Book of Acts occupies in history. He examines the non-Biblical sources to confirm the data of the Acts. Included are the validity of the account of Artemis' Temple in Ephesus, the position that the Jews occupied in the Roman Empire, the oriental features of Greco-Roman civilization, etc. A syncretism in religion, culture, and civilization was a characteristic of the historical setting of the Christian beginnings. "Such a world needed a universal religion."

In the following two chapters the author presents the Book of Acts within the context of the Greek and Roman world. He deals with the language of the book in relation to contemporary Greek. A comparison is made between theological and other terms of the Acts and equivalent terms found in contemporary secular authors. Such terms as *orothesia*, *skolekobrotos*, *grammateus*, etc., are discussed. The author's purpose is to show that the author of the Acts breathed the same air as his contemporaries. Of course, the Greek cultural background covers a larger area with which Cadbury deals.

The Roman background includes legal matters and matters of civilization, such as citizenship, names, roads, citizenship by emancipation, citizens of colonies and the Roman way of handling them, the position of the colonies in the Roman Empire, etc.

In regards to the Jewish background, the author says that the Book of Acts is a source of knowledge not only of Judaism in Palestine but of the Judaism of the Diaspora as well. Synagogues, Semitism, anti-Semitism, influence of foreign traditions upon the Jews, change of names — information about all these can be found in the Book of Acts. Briefly Cadbury indicates that Luke displays in the Acts convincing evidence of his knowledge of the Jewish environment of the early Church.

Cadbury presents data from canonical and non-canonical sources about the Church in the various provinces of the Roman Empire. He believes that the Christian environment is the innermost circle out of which comes the Book of Acts. In the last chapter Cadbury deals with the history of the Book of Acts in itself: how it came to be written, its relation to the Gospel of Luke, canonicity, its relations with Paul's letters, etc.

The general motive of the author is apologetic. Cadbury tries to confirm the reliability of the Book of Acts in relation to its Greek, Roman, Jewish and early Christian background. The understanding of all this is important for an understanding of the history of the Early Church in Acts. To do this one needs to have a knowledge of the historic and cultural situation which surrounds the Book of Acts.

REV. DEMETRIOS J. CONSTANTELOS

LIONEL S. THORNTON, *Christ and the Church*. Westminster (England): Dacre Press, 1956. Pp. 151.

This book is the third part of a work on "The Form of the Servant." The author begins with the assumption that the doctrine of the Church is of vital significance and not merely a corollary of the Christian faith. If we believe in Christ we must believe in the Church, for Christ's message to man is embodied in it.

As in the case with other authors, Thornton traces the origin of the Christian Ecclesia back to the Old Testament. He tries to prove the unity of the Revelation, the Old Covenant made between God and man through Abraham and Moses, and the New, concluded between God and man in Christ. The Church is the New Israel, which is a continuation of the Old Israel whose special call is traced back by way of David and Moses to Abraham. The New Israel marks the culmination of the Messianic expectations.

A basic conception of the author is that Christ and the Church constitute a single divine-human mystery. This mystery is understood only "by paying careful attention to the forms and modes in which and through which it is unfolded in scripture." Hence he examines the various analogies and unities that are found in both the Old and the New Testaments. Thornton presents the analogies and the relationships between the old creation of the Old Testament with the new creation of the New Testament manifested in Christ; the Old Adam and the New Adam; the transfiguration of Christ in analogy to the life of the Church and so forth.

The author is obscure at points. It seems to me that though he might be original and probably a pioneer in such an approach to this important subject, he tends to overdraw analogies between Old and New Testament events, events which might be simply historical or circumstantial without any real significance for the New Testament.

REV. DEMETRIOS J. CONSTANTELOS



Copyright and Use:

As an ATLAS user, you may print, download, or send articles for individual use according to fair use as defined by U.S. and international copyright law and as otherwise authorized under your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement.

No content may be copied or emailed to multiple sites or publicly posted without the copyright holder(s)' express written permission. Any use, decompiling, reproduction, or distribution of this journal in excess of fair use provisions may be a violation of copyright law.

This journal is made available to you through the ATLAS collection with permission from the copyright holder(s). The copyright holder for an entire issue of a journal typically is the journal owner, who also may own the copyright in each article. However, for certain articles, the author of the article may maintain the copyright in the article. Please contact the copyright holder(s) to request permission to use an article or specific work for any use not covered by the fair use provisions of the copyright laws or covered by your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement. For information regarding the copyright holder(s), please refer to the copyright information in the journal, if available, or contact ATLA to request contact information for the copyright holder(s).

About ATLAS:

The ATLA Serials (ATLAS®) collection contains electronic versions of previously published religion and theology journals reproduced with permission. The ATLAS collection is owned and managed by the American Theological Library Association (ATLA) and received initial funding from Lilly Endowment Inc.

The design and final form of this electronic document is the property of the American Theological Library Association.

and well-founded conclusions for persons, situations, and events of the fifth and sixth centuries are a good example of unprejudiced examination and workmanship in the field of Byzantine studies.

Based primarily upon all available contemporary information, Bury tried to reconstruct the transitory period from 395 A.D., the year of the death of Theodosius I, to 565 A.D., the death of Justinian, that is the period of gradual transformation of the Eastern Roman Empire into what is known as Byzantine Empire; while, at the same time, he traces the decline and collapse of the Western Roman Empire, and its eventual dismemberment into small barbaric states. The parallel examination of East and West, interconnected as they were by many ties, but also naturally divided by differences in character and situations, gives a panoramic and vivid picture of the various peoples around the Mediterranean Sea, and of the manifest or hidden powers, reasons, and aspirations working in transforming their political and cultural status.

Of the two volumes, the second, devoted to the long, eventful and fruitful period of Justinian, is, perhaps, by far the best part of the whole work. The great personalities of that glorious era are vividly depicted, so that one may better understand the impact of their actions at that and subsequent periods. However, the entire work is not only sound historical narration but pleasant reading too. We hope that the other works of Bury on Byzantine history, since long out of print, may be reprinted in such neat, easily available, paper-bound editions.

COSTAS M. PROUSSIS

CHRISTOS VRIONIDES, *The Byzantine Music of the Greek Orthodox Church*. Byzantium Publishers, Christos Vrionides, P.O. Box 459, Babylon, Long Island, N. Y. Pp. 281. Paper. \$5.00.

Mr. Vrionides has been well-known and respected in the musical world as a choral and orchestral conductor, bass violist, tenor soloist and cantor, organizer of the highly successful Byzantine Ensemble, lecturer on Byzantine Chant, and author of several other books. His latest book on Byzantine Chant, a translation of an earlier work in Greek, is certainly a welcome addition to the scant literature on this subject in the English language.

It is intended primarily as a textbook and serves this purpose well. The fifty-two chapters are divided into five parts: I. a general intro-

duction of both historical and theoretical nature; II. an explanation of the quantitative symbols of the Chrysanthine notation; III. qualitative symbols; IV. modes; V. additional historical information, a chronological list of contributors to the Byzantine literature — musicians and hymnographers, the evolution of notation, and many other interesting facts.

The sections of the book which are devoted to the purely theoretical aspects of the chant, the meaning of the notation and the execution of the music are quite complete and presented in good order. Examples and exercises are included in the Chrysanthine notation, and a special section is devoted to these same exercises in western notation. For the sake of clarity, both notations are occasionally employed simultaneously.

The work in other parts appears to be rather disorganized and in general should have undergone more critical editing for the elimination of typographical errors which in some cases could cause confusion and also for the completion of certain examples which in their present form are difficult if not impossible for non-Greek readers to comprehend. It would also have been wise to adopt a consistent and western terminology concerning modes, fundamental and dominant tones, cadences, etc, to make it less difficult for students to pass on to other books of the same nature.

Although Mr. Vrionides makes no attempt or claim to profound scholarship in this book, the historical aspects are based upon a predominantly Greek bibliography of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries (Παπαδόπουλος: *Συμβολαὶ εἰς τὴν ιστορίαν τῆς παρ’ ἡμῖν ἐκκλησιαστικῆς μονοικῆς*, Athens, 1890. Ψάχος: *Ἡ παρασημαντικὴ τῆς Βυζαντινῆς μονοικῆς*, Athens, 1917.) with a resulting propagation of theories which in the light of contemporary western scholarship are untenable. This applies particularly to Psachos' Stenographic Notation Theory (p. 10) which has been refuted by H. J. W. Tillyard and Egon Wellesz.

On the whole, however, this endeavor by Mr. Vrionides should be well-received by those seeking instruction in the elements of Byzantine Chant according to modern usage.

DEAN BOUZIANIS

CHARLES NORRIS COCHRANE, *Christianity and Classical Culture: A Study of Thought and Action from Augustus to Augustine*. New



Copyright and Use:

As an ATLAS user, you may print, download, or send articles for individual use according to fair use as defined by U.S. and international copyright law and as otherwise authorized under your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement.

No content may be copied or emailed to multiple sites or publicly posted without the copyright holder(s)' express written permission. Any use, decompiling, reproduction, or distribution of this journal in excess of fair use provisions may be a violation of copyright law.

This journal is made available to you through the ATLAS collection with permission from the copyright holder(s). The copyright holder for an entire issue of a journal typically is the journal owner, who also may own the copyright in each article. However, for certain articles, the author of the article may maintain the copyright in the article. Please contact the copyright holder(s) to request permission to use an article or specific work for any use not covered by the fair use provisions of the copyright laws or covered by your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement. For information regarding the copyright holder(s), please refer to the copyright information in the journal, if available, or contact ATLA to request contact information for the copyright holder(s).

About ATLAS:

The ATLA Serials (ATLAS®) collection contains electronic versions of previously published religion and theology journals reproduced with permission. The ATLAS collection is owned and managed by the American Theological Library Association (ATLA) and received initial funding from Lilly Endowment Inc.

The design and final form of this electronic document is the property of the American Theological Library Association.

THE GREEK ORTHODOX THEOLOGICAL REVIEW

VOLUME V

NUMBER 1

S U M M E R , 1 9 5 9



Published Biannually by the

Holy Cross
Greek Orthodox Theological School Press
50 Goddard Avenue
Brookline 46, Massachusetts

Copyright by

THE GREEK ARCHDIOCESE HOLY CROSS ORTHODOX THEOLOGICAL SCHOOL, INC.

THE GREEK ORTHODOX THEOLOGICAL REVIEW

Editorial Board

HIS EMINENCE, ARCHBISHOP IAKOVOS, *President*

REV. JOHN S. ROMANIDES, *Editor*

GEORGE A. PANICHAS, *Associate Editor*

JOHN E. REXINE, *Managing Editor*

Editorial Advisory Board

SAVVAS AGOURIDES (University of Saloniκa)

MILTON V. ANASTOS (Dumbarton Oaks, Harvard University)

CONSTANTINE BONIS (University of Athens)

PETER CHARANIS (Rutgers University)

PANAGIOTES CHRISTOU (University of Saloniκa)

REV. CHRYSOSTOMOS KONSTANTINIDES (Halki Theological School)

VERY REV. GEORGES FLOROVSKY (Harvard Divinity School)

DENO J. GEANAKOPLOS (University of Illinois)

VASIL ISTAVRIDIS (Halki Theological School)

JOHN N. KARMIRIS (University of Athens)

GERASIMOS KONIDARIS (University of Athens)

VERY REV. GERASIMOS PAPADOPoulos (Holy Cross Theological School)

VERY REV. JOHN PAPADOPoulos, Dean (Holy Cross Theological School)

COSTAS M. PROUSSIS (Holy Cross Theological School)

PETER TOPPING (Gennadius Library, Athens)

VERY REV. GEORGE TSOUMAS (Holy Cross Theological School)

THE GREEK ORTHODOX THEOLOGICAL REVIEW



The Greek Orthodox Theological Review is a publication for the exchange of scholarly articles and reviews in the fields of Biblical, Patristic and Contemporary Orthodox Theology, Church History, Byzantine History, and related Classical Studies.

Subscription to *The Review* is three dollars and fifty cents annually. The price of individual copies is two dollars.

Communications for the Editor, books for review, and requests pertaining to advertising, subscriptions, or change of address for *The Review* should be addressed to Professor John E. Rexine, Managing Editor, *The Greek Orthodox Theological Review*, 50 Goddard Avenue, Brookline 46, Massachusetts.

Manuscripts should not exceed 7,500 words, and all references should appear on separate pages; all of these, as well as the text, should be double-spaced.

The Review is published twice a year, Winter and Summer, by the Holy Cross Orthodox Theological School Press, 50 Goddard Avenue, Brookline 46, Massachusetts. It is indexed in *Historical Abstracts*, *Religious and Theological Abstracts*, and the *Index to Religious Periodical Literature*.

CONTENTS

ARTICLES

Editorial: Statement of Purpose 7-8

Orthodoxy and Anglicanism in the Twentieth Century
VASIL T. ISTAVRIDIS 9-26

The Problem Concerning Faith and Knowledge as Expounded
in the Letters of St. Basil the Great to Amphilochius of
Iconium
CONSTANTINE G. BONIS 27-44

Images of God and Anti-God: Studies in the Metaphysics of
Dostoyevski
C. B. ASHANIN 45-54

H. A. Wolfson's Philosophy of the Church Fathers
REV. JOHN S. ROMANIDES 55-82

BOOK REVIEWS

Emperor Michael Palaeologus and the West, by Deno John
Geanakoplos
Reviewed by COSTAS M. PROUSSIS 83-85

The Holy Eucharist, by Markos Siotis
Reviewed by GEORGE S. BEBIS 85-87

Byzantine Sacred Art, by Constantine Cavarnos
Reviewed by DEMETRIOS DUKAS 88-90

Hellenism: The History of a Civilization, by Arnold J. Toynbee
Reviewed by COSTAS M. PROUSSIS 90-93

The Ecclesiology of St. Basil the Great, by John Karmires
Reviewed by GEORGE S. BEBIS 93-96

BOOK NOTES 97-109

F. Van Der Meer and Christine Mohrmann, *Atlas of the Early Christian World* (Rexine)

Steven Runciman, *Byzantine Civilization* (Rexine)

Francis Dvornik, *The Idea of Apostolicity in Byzantium and the Legend of Saint Andrew* (Rexine)

Hans Von Campenhausen, *The Fathers of the Greek Church* (Rexine)

Raymond Etteldorf, *The Catholic Church in the Middle East* (Rexine)

D. Talbot Rice, *The Beginnings of Christian Art* (Rexine)

Balmer H. Kelly, *The Layman's Bible Commentary*, Vol. I; Vol. XIV (Rexine)

LeRoy H. Appleton and Stephen Bridges, *Symbolism in Liturgical Art* (Rexine)

Louis Linn and Leo Schwarz, *Psychiatry and Religious Experience* (Veronis)

Henry J. Cadbury, *The Book of Acts in History* (Constantelos)

Lionel S. Thornton, *Christ and the Church* (Constantelos)

EDITORIAL

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

Before and after his elevation to the Archeepiscopal throne of North and South America His Eminence, Archbishop Iakovos, who has recently been elected to one of the presidencies of the World Council of Churches, displayed in many ways his deep concern for the problems of Christian unity and the establishment of the spirit of mutual trust and cooperation among the divided Churches. As was expected this clear-sighted orientation toward these vital issues has also affected *The Greek Orthodox Theological Review*.

A glance at the newly formed editorial advisory board impresses one with the fact that Archbishop Iakovos desires that *The Review* take its place in the general discussion concerning the theological and cultural factors involved in any proper appreciation and understanding of the present condition of the Churches generally and of the Orthodox Churches especially.

His Eminence has emphasized repeatedly on many occasions that we are not so naive as to believe it possible to find quick solutions to the problems of the disunited non-Orthodox Churches. Rather we do and should consider our participation in the work of the World Council of Churches as a get-acquainted period in the history of the Churches, which, as a segment of history, is quite unique. It is not at all like the heated *Filioque* and papal supremacy controversies which were dominated by the Roman Church's refusal to take the theological background of the Ecumenical Councils seriously and by an obsessed papacy's dream of reducing her sister Churches to the status of slaves and of becoming not only Father but even Lord and Master of former brothers. This get-acquainted period should certainly not be dominated by the post-Reformation apologetics and polemics which studied primitive and ancient Church history and doctrine either to find arguments for or against something or else to describe the historical progress of the falling away from the truth of the other Churches.

It is quite obvious that many theologians of certain Churches are today showing signs of developing a more objective and appreciative attitude toward diversity of possibilities and are testing these possibilities. The narrow confessional limitations are being overcome. Theologians are more willing to listen sympathetically to the other point of view. Within this new atmosphere of theological research Orthodox patristic theology can prove helpful.

Of course, it is one thing to develop a more or less objective attitude which may lead to a sincere appreciation and adequate understanding of the other position, but it is quite foolish to adopt the comprehensive attitude of many who are for overlooking the theological and confessional barriers with vague and sentimental ideas concerning unity.

It is not the purpose of *The Greek Orthodox Theological Review* to offer solutions to the problems faced by Ecumenically minded Christians. Its purpose is to coordinate pertinent material which will perhaps help Christians of Occidental theological and cultural orientation to better understand and perhaps learn to appreciate the theological presuppositions of Orthodox piety and especially of the reality of Orthodox unity.

The Review will try to include in each issue articles translated from languages which are generally inaccessible to English-speaking Christians and even to the specialist theologians. In present day Greece, for example, a patristic, monastic and artistic revival has quietly been in the making for several years and some theological, biblical, pietistic and artistic directions taken after the XVIth century and especially after the Greek Revolution (1828) are seriously questioned and challenged. Following these developments should prove very interesting and perhaps helpful. An acquaintance with this revival should prove especially beneficial to the Greek Orthodox Christians of America whose theological education has not as yet been affected by the new developments in Greek theology.

its validity or has been led to its misinterpretation. This rule applies fittingly, one might say, in the case of the ecclesiology of the ancient Church. For the earlier Christians the Church was indeed an existential reality, whose essence and mission have not been overtaken by the contemporary absurdities of those times, and whose presence in the world has become a historical fact which needed neither prolific expositions nor dogmatic treatises. It is obvious, therefore, that the scholar who wants to form a corpus of thought concerning the ecclesiology of the early Church has to scrutinize with extreme patience the original sources in order to satisfy his "scientific" pursuit. This is the case with the ecclesiology of St. Basil the Great, one of the staunchest and most diligent theologians of the Early Church, whose wide scope of theological interest is well known to all Church historians. Nonetheless, Professor Karmires, who teaches systematic Theology at the School of Theology of the University of Athens, through painstaking investigation of the primary sources has offered to us a remarkable synthesis of St. Basil's ecclesiology with the assurance of an experienced scholar and the fierce faith of the Orthodox theologian.

Professor Karmires is careful to note that St. Basil has not handed down to us any specific definition on the essence and the nature of the Church. This, of course, we think, is a right step toward an objective study of the material at his disposal and it clears up the atmosphere from any misunderstanding. Because, as the author correctly observes, the Church is actually a "mysterium" which human reason cannot define in casual human terms. He is ready, however, to prove that St. Basil follows the Pauline interpretation, in characterizing the essence of the Church as the "Body of Christ," whose head is Christ and whose members are all the Christians. Naturally, this dogmatical basis of St. Basil's ecclesiology is of paramount importance in the history of doctrine since precisely by standing on this concrete Biblical basis, St. Basil was able to direct the defense and the offense of Orthodox Theology against the heresies of his times. Thus he writes to the Italians and Gauls (*Letter 92*) that all the heretics and the schismatics should put an end to their teachings and "may henceforth become subject to the authority of the Church, that the body of Christ, having returned to unity in all its parts, may be made perfect. . . ." Obvious here is the identification of the body of the Church with the mystical body of Christ. Moreover, for St. Basil the Church is the Bride of the Christ, the Vine of Christ, the House of God, whereas the Christians are the sons of this Bride, the branches of the Vine, the servants of divergent callings in this House. Absolute unity, therefore, harmony, substantial concurrence, combined with mutual love are for St. Basil not simply a superficial *modus vivendi* of loose and external structure of the Christian ecclesia, but ontological

reality based on pure Biblical substratum lived through history and explained with the interpretative typology of the Eastern tradition.

This is why St. Basil writes with unequivocal conviction that "all the rest of the Church, which from one end to the other has received the Gospel, abides by the sound and unchanged doctrine," the doctrine of the Trinity, upon which the unity of the Church is tested and proclaimed. Indeed, for St. Basil the unity of the Church is intrinsically bound up with the dogmatical unity as such. He rightly, then, points out that we are ". . . always same by the grace of God. . . . Our Creed is not one at Seleucia, and another at Constantinople, and another at Zela, and at Lampsacus another, and different at Rome; and our Creed that is now in circulation is not different from our former Creeds, but is always one and the same. For, as we have received it from the Lord, so we do baptize; as we baptize, so do we believe; as we believe, so we also pronounce the doxology, neither separating the Holy Spirit from the Father and Son, nor placing Him before the Father, nor saying that the Spirit is older than the Son, as the tongues of blasphemers contrive." (*Ibid.*) Needless to say, St. Basil emphasizes the liturgical character of the unity of the Church. He categorically states that "outside the divine court (i.e. the Church) the Lord should not be worshiped, but in it . . ." because the true "worship is not that which takes place outside the Church, but that which is performed in the court of God." (*Ad Psalm. 28, 1*) Therefore "the prayers should be offered in the middle of Jerusalem, i.e. the Church of God." (*Ad Ps. 115, 5*) Ecclesia, liturgy, dogma have for St. Basil equal standing and are interpreted by this great Father through the unity of his profound thought and the unity of his own experience. For him "compartments" of theological disciplines did not have any fundamental value. Theory and praxis, teaching and worship are one for the great theologian who lived all the drama of the tearing of the seamless Robe of the Lord. This is why the ecclesiology of St. Basil is examined here by Professor Karmires in the totality of his thinking and in the spectrum of his whole theological structure. But Professor Karmires does not stop here. He discusses the pre-existence of the Church as it is interpreted by St. Basil (which of course had been already taught by Clement of Rome, Justin, Hermas, Origen). He discusses also quite extensively and particularly, the conception of tradition, which contributes greatly toward the understanding of the ecclesiology of St. Basil, as well as his conceptions concerning the relation of Church and State. On this point St. Basil is ready to accept a kind of mutual recognition of each other's reality, a co-existence and co-operation in their tasks and destinies respectively. The Church, however, should be awakened to confront any interference of the State in the internal affairs of the Church, es-

pecially in the lofty field of dogmatical theology. St. Basil's life *has* been, indeed, a practical verification of this wise and firm stance.

Professor Karmires has developed a special talent in expounding the dogmatical teachings of the Fathers of the Church. He studies them profoundly and then brings them in the foreground in order to present them as they are and what they really have taught. Though he discusses them lucidly, he wants to let them speak for themselves through their own writings, through their own thoughts. His methodology is indeed realistic and constructive. Professor Karmires' intellectual brilliance, systematic efficiency, and industrious productivity lie precisely in his ability to offer the message of the Fathers of the Church, and the essence, in general, of the Orthodox dogmatical teaching, with clarity, calmness, and objectivity. He is unquestionably a master in his field. His reconstruction of St. Basil's ecclesiology is a proof that Professor Karmires is an experienced and consummate translator of the Greek Fathers' dogmatic thought which in the present small, but comprehensive volume, is depicted with the mystical authority of the old and the simple freshness of the always young and new, positive characteristics of the Orthodox theology.

GEORGE S. BEBIS

NOTES ON THE CONTRIBUTORS

C. B. ASHANIN, a member of the Department of Divinity, University College of Ghana, is a regular contributor to ecclesiastical publications.

GEORGE S. BEBIS, formerly Assistant Professor of Patristics at the Holy Cross Orthodox Theological School, is currently engaged in advanced graduate work at the Harvard Divinity School.

DR. CONSTANTINE BONIS, a leading Greek theologian, is Professor of Patristics at the School of Theology of the University of Athens, Greece.

REV. DEMETRIOS J. CONSTANTELOS, pastor of St. Demetrios Greek Orthodox Church, Perth Amboy, New Jersey, is doing graduate work at the Princeton Theological Seminary and is editor of "The Religious Omnibus" for *The Orthodox Observer*.

DEMETRIOS DUKAS, Lecturer on Byzantine Iconography at the Holy Cross Orthodox Theological School, is a well-known Byzantine-style iconographer.

DR. VASIL T. ISTAVRIDIS, Professor of Church History at the Theological School of Halki, Constantinople, is well known in Orthodox circles as a prolific scholar in his field.

DR. COSTAS M. PROUSSIS, who teaches classical philology and philosophy at the Holy Cross Orthodox Theological School, is a recognized authority in the field of Greek studies.

JOHN E. REXINE, recently appointed Managing Editor of *The Greek Orthodox Theological Review*, has taught at Brandeis University and Colgate University. Book Review Editor for *The Orthodox Observer*, Professor Rexine is a frequent contributor to professional journals and is the author of the book, *Religion in Plato and Cicero* (Philosophical Library, 1959).

REV. DR. JOHN S. ROMANIDES, the recently appointed Editor of *The Greek Orthodox Theological Review*, is professor of Dogmatic Theology at the Holy Cross Orthodox Theological School and the author of a book in Greek entitled *Original Sin*.

ALEXANDER VERONIS, a graduate of the Holy Cross Orthodox Theological School, is specializing in pastoral psychology at the Boston University School of Theology.

RECENT BOOKS AVAILABLE FROM
THE HOLY CROSS BOOKSTORE

Rt. Rev. Bishop Athenagoras Kokkinakis
PARENTS AND PRIESTS AS SERVANTS OF REDEMPTION

\$4.00



The Very Rev. John Papadopoulos

ΠΟΙΜΑΝΤΙΚΗ

\$3.75



The Rev. Dr. John S. Romanides
ΤΟ ΠΡΟΠΑΤΟΡΙΚΟΝ ΑΜΑΡΤΗΜΑ

\$2.80



Professor John E. Rexine
RELIGION IN PLATO AND CICERO

\$2.75



Professor Christos Vrionides

THE BYZANTINE CHANT OF THE GREEK ORTHODOX CHURCH

\$5.00

Address orders to:

The Holy Cross Bookstore
Holy Cross Greek Orthodox, Theological School
50 Goddard Avenue
Brookline 46, Massachusetts

Make remittances payable to HOLY CROSS BOOKSTORE



Copyright and Use:

As an ATLAS user, you may print, download, or send articles for individual use according to fair use as defined by U.S. and international copyright law and as otherwise authorized under your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement.

No content may be copied or emailed to multiple sites or publicly posted without the copyright holder(s)' express written permission. Any use, decompiling, reproduction, or distribution of this journal in excess of fair use provisions may be a violation of copyright law.

This journal is made available to you through the ATLAS collection with permission from the copyright holder(s). The copyright holder for an entire issue of a journal typically is the journal owner, who also may own the copyright in each article. However, for certain articles, the author of the article may maintain the copyright in the article. Please contact the copyright holder(s) to request permission to use an article or specific work for any use not covered by the fair use provisions of the copyright laws or covered by your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement. For information regarding the copyright holder(s), please refer to the copyright information in the journal, if available, or contact ATLA to request contact information for the copyright holder(s).

About ATLAS:

The ATLA Serials (ATLAS®) collection contains electronic versions of previously published religion and theology journals reproduced with permission. The ATLAS collection is owned and managed by the American Theological Library Association (ATLA) and received initial funding from Lilly Endowment Inc.

The design and final form of this electronic document is the property of the American Theological Library Association.

The Greek Orthodox Theological Review

VOLUME VI

NUMBER 1

SUMMER, 1960



Published by the
Holy Cross
Greek Orthodox Theological School Press
Brookline, Massachusetts

THE GREEK ORTHODOX THEOLOGICAL REVIEW

VOLUME VI

NUMBER 1

SUMMER, 1960



Published Biannually by the
Holy Cross
Greek Orthodox Theological School Press
50 Goddard Avenue
Brookline 46, Massachusetts

Ideas and opinions expressed in any Article appearing in this *Review* are those of the Author of the Article, and do not necessarily represent the ideas and opinions of the Editors.

Copyright by

THE GREEK ARCHDIOCESE HOLY CROSS ORTHODOX THEOLOGICAL SCHOOL, INC.

THE GREEK ORTHODOX THEOLOGICAL REVIEW

Editorial Board

HIS EMINENCE, ARCHBISHOP IAKOVOS, *President*

THE REV. JOHN S. ROMANIDES, *Editor*

JOHN E. REXINE, *Associate Editor*

RICHARD STOCKTON, *Managing Editor*

Editorial Advisory Board

SAVVAS AGOURIDES (University of Salonika)

MILTON V. ANASTOS (Dumbarton Oaks, Harvard University)

CONSTANTINE BONIS (University of Athens)

PETER CHARANIS (Rutgers University)

PANAGIOTES CHRISTOU (University of Salonika)

THE REV. CHRYSOSTOMOS KONSTANTINIDES (Halki Theolog. School)

THE VERY REV. GEORGES FLOROVSKY (Harvard Divinity School)

DENO J. GEANAKOPLOS (University of Illinois)

VASIL ISTAVRIDIS (Halki Theological School)

JOHN N. KARMIRIS (University of Athens)

GERASIMOS KONIDARIS (University of Athens)

THE VERY REV. GERASIMOS PAPADOPOULOS (Holy Cross Theol. School)

COSTAS M. PROUSSIS (Holy Cross Theological School)

PETER TOPPING (Gennadius Library, Athens)

THE REV. GEORGE TSOUMAS (Holy Cross Theological School)

THE GREEK ORTHODOX THEOLOGICAL REVIEW



The Greek Orthodox Theological Review is a publication for the exchange of scholarly articles and reviews in the fields of Biblical, Patristic and Contemporary Orthodox Theology, Church History, Byzantine History, and related Classical Studies.

Subscription to *The Review* is three dollars and fifty cents annually. The price of individual copies is two dollars.

Communications for the Editor, books for review, and requests pertaining to advertising, subscriptions, or change of address for *The Review* should be addressed to Professor Richard Stockton, Managing Editor, *The Greek Orthodox Theological Review*, 50 Goddard Avenue, Brookline 46, Massachusetts.

Manuscripts should be double-spaced and all references should appear on separate pages.

The Review is published twice a year, Winter and Summer, by the Holy Cross Orthodox Theological School Press, 50 Goddard Avenue, Brookline 46, Massachusetts. It is indexed in *Historical Abstracts*, *Religious and Theological Abstracts*, and the *Index to Religious Periodical Literature*.

THE GREEK ORTHODOX THEOLOGICAL REVIEW

VOLUME VI

SUMMER, 1960

NUMBER 1

CONTENTS

ARTICLES:

Constantine Oikonomos of the House of Oikonomos
and the Operations of the British Bible Society in
Greece (1780-1857) MARK SIOTES 7-55

The Ecumenical Patriarchate Under the Turkish Re-
public: The First Ten Years HARRY J. PSOMIADES 56-80

BOOK REVIEWS:

Turkey in the World, by Altemur Kılıç
Reviewed by HARRY J. PSOMIADES 81-83

Crete and Mycenaean Greece, by Spyridon Marinatos
Reviewed by COSTAS M. PROUSSIS 83-85

*In the Beginning: Some Greek Views on the Origins
of Life and the Early State of Man*, by W. K. C.
Guthrie
Reviewed by COSTAS M. PROUSSIS 85-87

*Karaites in Byzantium, the Formative Years, 970-
1100*, by Zvi Ankori
Reviewed by MORTON SMITH 87-88

*Mary the Virgin Mother of God According to the
Orthodox Faith*, by John O. Kalogerou
Reviewed by GEORGE S. BEBIS 88-92

The Art of Byzantium, by David Talbot Rice
Reviewed by COSTAS M. PROUSSIS 92-94

<i>The Silent Rebellion: Anglican Religious Communities 1845-1900</i> , by A. M. Allchin Reviewed by RICHARD STOCKTON	94-97
<i>The Riddle of Roman Catholicism</i> , by Jaroslav Pelican Reviewed by REV. STANLEY S. HARAKAS	97-99
<i>Teach Yourself New Testament Greek</i> , by D. F. Hudson Reviewed by COSTAS M. PROUSSIS	99-102
BOOK NOTES	103-123
BOOKS RECEIVED	124

BOOK REVIEWS

ALTEMUR KILIÇ, *Turkey in the World*. Washington, D. C.: Public Affairs Press, 1959. Pp. 224.

The study of Turkey in the West has been particularly affected by myths ancient and modern. It is therefore with great satisfaction that we welcome the efforts of Turkish scholars to record and recount their country's history and to lay bare the hieratic mysteries of the inscrutable East. In recent years Turkish scholars have produced some excellent works in the English language: Among these are: *Turkish Nationalism and Western Civilization: Selected Essays*, by Ziya Gökalp, translated and edited by Niyazi Berkes, New York: Columbia University Press, 1959; and *Turkey's Politics: The Transition to a Multi-Party System*, by Kemal H. Karpat, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1959.

Unfortunately, the work by Mr. Kiliç, who since 1955 has been the Press Attaché of the Turkish embassy in Washington, D. C., does not fall within this category. It is replete with misleading generalizations and erroneous statements. It is very close to being a propaganda tract in which the Turks can do no wrong while others constantly succumb to human frailty. The book is of little value to the specialist on Turkish affairs and not a very trustworthy guide for the general reader. Although it offers scarcely any new ideas or facts, the appraisal of events and policies with reference to Turkey's stand against Communism is noteworthy.

I seriously question the author's statement that the Turkish leaders of the xixth century and the Young Turks who followed them were sincerely interested in coöoperating with their 'brother Ottomans' — Greeks, Armenians, Arabs, and Albanians (p. 17). It was not Arab Nationalism which betrayed the Turks, but Turkish Nationalism which forced the Arabs into the Allied camp during World War I (pp. 17 and 70). Moreover, it is also a fact that the Balkan Wars did *not* result from Entente intrigue (p. 25). The Entente powers did everything they could to prevent the Balkan powers from going to war against Turkey.

On page 45 the author states that the Lausanne Treaty provided that the Greek population in Anatolia was to be exchanged for the Turkish population in Western Thrace. In fact, the instrument for the exchange of Greek and Turkish population, signed at Lausanne, January 30, 1923, provided for the compulsory exchange of Turkish nationals of the Greek Orthodox religion established in Turkish territory, except those on the islands of Imbros and Tenedos and those who were established in Constantinople before October 30, 1918, and of Greek nationals of the Muslim religion except those in Western Thrace. On page 47, the author states that a move was made after Lausanne to name a Greek Patriarch who would be subservient to the interests of the Allies. He presumably has in mind Meletios IV and Constantine VI. In fact, it was the Greek Government which urged Meletios IV to leave Constantinople on July 10, 1923, and compelled him to abdicate on September 20, 1923. The case of Constantine VI is more complicated. It did not merely involve the Patriarch but seriously threatened to remove the Ecumenical Patriarchate from its historical See and to undermine the spiritual authority of the church. Constantine VI was not expelled from Turkey in 1929, as the author states, but in January 1925 (p. 51). The Mosul area which was awarded to Iraq in 1925 was not predominantly Turkish, but Kurdish (p. 60).

In the discussion of the Cyprus question, the Turkish position is exalted and the Greeks are made to appear ridiculous. The author completely fails to understand the Greek position; in fact, he does not even try to do so (p. 167 f.). In conclusion, I should like to say a few words about a theme which the author states and which was on the lips of many of the Turks I interviewed while in Turkey in the summer of 1955 and in the last six months of 1957. They accused the official Greek Orthodox Church of being imperialistic and condemned it for inciting the Greek Revolution of 1821.

But although the ultimate goals of the Phanar and the Porte were quite different, their practical interests were surprisingly similar. The Ecumenical Patriarchate and the Greek Phanariots in the service of the Ottoman state were opposed to the dismemberment of the Ottoman Empire, as they saw in its dismemberment their own impoverishment. They tried, indeed, to conserve the legacy of the Porte, but realizing that a change was necessary, they attempted to convert the Empire into a confederation of

Christian and Muslim states in which the Greek element would play a leading rôle. But the rise of Balkan and Turkish nationalism, as well as the political interests of the Great Powers, prohibited the realization of this plan; in fact, the Patriarchal and Phanariot idea was first betrayed by the Greek Revolution.

'But when the modern national conscience awoke, the Church would not be expected to assume a rôle, that of fostering and conducting the Revolution, which was directly in contradiction with its nature and constitution; this rôle ought to be, and in fact was assumed by elements foreign to the official Church, not only in 1821, but also in former attempts at liberation; for the mission of the Church had ended there.' (Theodore H. Papadopoulos, *Studies and Documents Relating to the History of the Greek Church and People Under the Turkish Domination*. Brussels, 1952, pp. 157-158.)

HARRY J. PSOMIADES

SPYRIDON MARINATOS, *Crete and Mycenaean Greece*. Photographs by Max Hirmer. Athens: Editions Athens, 1959. Pp. 127, 236 Black and White and XLIII Colored Illustrations.

This impressive book is a general introduction to Creto-Mycenæan civilization, presented in an authoritative text and well-selected pictures. Professor Marinatos, who wrote the text, is an archæologist of international stature, especially in the field of prehistoric Greek and Middle-Eastern archæology, having conducted extensive and successful excavations and research in many prehistoric Greek locations, and having written repeatedly and authoritatively on the subject. The photographs have been taken and arranged by Professor Hirmer, a well-known expert in rendering the true qualities of a work of art, as he has shown in similar books in which he has collaborated — for instance, in *The Art of Byzantium* (reviewed elsewhere in this issue) and *Early Christian Art*. This happy collaboration has resulted in a magnificent book on Minoan Crete and Mycenaean Greece not only for the uninitiated layman, as was primarily intended, but also for the informed scholar. The book has been published simultaneously in America, England, Germany, Italy, and Greece. I am here writing about the Greek edition.

Crete is the first subject dealt with by Professor Marinatos.

He examines the geography and economy of Crete, its history and civilization, its religion and chronology, its life, art, handicraft, and industry (pp. 7-52). The chapter on life, art, and handicraft is subdivided into four general periods of Cretan culture, with special emphasis on the various artistic achievements and expressions during the 'golden age' of Crete. In the second part (pp. 53-70), devoted to Mycenæan Greece, Professor Marinatos writes about the various Mycenæan centers in Greece proper, about their tomb architecture, and their art and life. Helpful notes (pp. 71-74) to the above text and a short bibliographical note (p. 75) are added. There follow 279 pages of pictures (43 color and 236 monochrome plates) for Crete and Mycenæan Greece, and a complete and detailed explanatory text for these pictures (pp. 77-125). This last part of the text is further supplied with 35 other pictures and plans for the better description and understanding of specific objects.

All in all, it is a well composed and impressive work which comprehensively presents the life and art of the Cretan and Mycenæan world, a work based on sound scholarship and imaginative but well-founded and convincing reconstruction. Many aspects concerning religion, art and life, not only of ancient times but even of today, are traced back to the periods of Cretan and Mycenæan culture, when for the first time life and civilization were organized on European soil. It is not easy to present or summarize all of them here, except for some scattered relevant observations: The religion in Crete was a kind of imperfect monotheism. It seems that the Cretans believed in one Deity, manifested and expressed in many symbols — something which reminds the author of the many qualities and names attributed by the Christians to the Virgin Mary. Though they did not build regular temples, yet they used to worship in sacred caves, in special places of their houses and palaces, places like chapels (p. 21). There are traces suggesting a belief in a kind of holy trinity (p. 23). A special feature of Cretan art is its love for colors, which is apparent not only in the beautiful frescoes but also in the vase painting. And although this art is somewhat static and traditional, many times it shows a bold dynamism and it is almost modern (p. 26 and elsewhere). The first cities on European soil were built in Crete almost 2000 years B.C. (p. 30); and they were built according to certain rules of town-planning (p. 41). The Cretans lived in many-storied houses and had comforts and ac-

commodations unknown even later to other ancient peoples and only recently used in modern living (p. 41). The first portrait on European soil was painted in Crete (p. 31). The first gloves anywhere in the world appear in a Cretan painting (p. 89). The pairs of falcons on the golden Mycenæan chain of picture 205 are, perhaps, the model for the double-headed eagle used many centuries later as the emblem of the Byzantine Empire.

Noteworthy is the theory propounded by Professor Marinatos that the palaces of Cnossos and other cities in Crete were not destroyed by the fire of some invaders (the Achæan invaders, as many scholars believed), but by floods and fire originated from earthquakes somewhere in the Aegean Sea, probably from an earthquake in the island of Thera (Santorini) (p. 14 f.). He corroborates his opinion with the example of the eruption in 1887 of the volcano Krakatau in the Dutch Indies, which was accompanied by tidal waves causing terrible destruction as far away as the islands of Java and Sumatra. One may add the recent earthquakes in Chile, which caused destructive tidal waves thousands of miles westward among the islands of the Pacific Ocean. Thus the Achæans seem to be absolved of the charge that they destroyed, by fire and sword, the Minoan civilization. This is one of the reasons why Professor Marinatos believes that, though Mycenæan civilization owes much to the Minoans, yet its main source was not Crete but Egypt (p. 55 f.).

The above-mentioned are only few and rather disconnected glimpses of the many interesting facts and ideas that are stored in this precious book. But, the most interesting of all is the notion and feeling one acquires when perusing this book, that in Crete and Mycenaean Greece there lived highly cultured peoples, more sophisticated and more fond of the goods of life in Crete, more virile, hardened and pragmatic in Mycenæan Greece. The Greek civilization of later centuries as well as the civilization of the whole Western world owes much to those first brilliant cultures on European soil.

COSTAS M. PROUSSIS

W. K. C. GUTHRIE, *In the Beginning: Some Greek Views on the Origins of Life and the Early State of Man*. Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 1957. Pp. 151.

The problem of the origin of life, and consequently the prob-

lem of the origins of man and civilization, has always occupied the mind of man from primitive times till now. The first answers given to the problem were part of the mythologies of the different peoples. Little by little, however, philosophers and historians, scientists and theologians and others have taken over the task of giving their own answers to the questions; thus, different, manifold, and frequently contrasting answers have resulted in the course of this endeavor. The answers, however, have been basically two: *a*) there was always life; and *b*) life originated in time either mechanically or by a transcendent power. Both answers first appeared, in one way or another, in the mythologies of different peoples, and formed part of their cosmological or religious beliefs, which eventually influenced also the relevant theories of specific thinkers. Professor Guthrie presents in this book what he thinks the ancient Greeks believed in this matter.

Though the book consists of six lectures delivered by Professor Guthrie at Cornell University in 1957 (thus retaining much of the informal character of oral speech), yet it is a good introduction to 'some Greek views on the origins of life and the early state of man,' and eventually to the origin of civilization according to those Greek views. The simplicity and clarity necessitated by the character of oral speech enhance the strict and clear delineation of the basic subject and make its comprehension easier. On the other hand, the addition of abundant notes at the end of the book with complete references and brief discussions of collateral themes, provides the author with the opportunity to support his views in a scholarly and convincing manner.

From another point of view, this work is also a testing ground both of the mythopoetic ability of the Greek mind and of its ability for strictly regulated reasoning. Professor Guthrie writes: 'In any case I want to look at my subject — the beginnings of life — as an instance of the remarkable way in which Greek thought provides a bridge between the worlds of myth and reason' (p. 17). And in truth, the transition from myth to reason — or better, the transfusion of myth into reason is well exemplified in the six chapters of the book, which are as follows: 1. 'Mother Earth. (I) The Myths'; 2. 'Mother Earth. (II) The scientific Approach'; 3. 'Body and Soul: The Kinship of Nature'; 4. 'Cycles of Existence: The Golden Age'; 5. 'The Idea of Progress'; 6. 'What Is Man? The Philosophical Implications.'

The first chapter illustrates the idea that men and animals

could be born from earth according to Greek myths, 'which obviously had more than a fairy-tale reality' even for classical Greece. This is better illustrated in the second chapter, in which the author examines the first scientific approach to the subject as it was attempted by some pre-Socratic philosophers. In the third, he considers some Greek ideas about the nature of life rather than its mere origins, especially the notions that 'there is no radical scientific difference between living and dead' and that to some Greek philosophers 'the boundary between animate and inanimate was non-existent.' Thus, the idea of kinship of all life is implied and further discussed with the aid of analogies from later Greek experience, and with some emphasis on 'the evolutionary character of early Greek theories about the origins of the world and of life.' This last aspect together with the belief in a past Golden Age and with the cyclic view of history, are dealt with in the fourth chapter. The seeming contradiction between a Golden Age and the cyclic recurrence of historical events is removed by the deft reconciliation of these opposite views in a new idea, the idea of progress, which was also a part of the Greek interpretation of historical life. This theme is discussed in the fifth chapter. The last chapter presents some of the philosophical implications resulting from the different and variant Greek views on the subject and points out the analogy with similar modern convictions and tendencies.

In general, this is an objective exposition of the subject, a clear and sober review and synthesis of its religious and philosophical ramifications in ancient Greece, and an important introduction to the general theme of the evolution of civilization from the Greek point of view.

Some misprints, but not of a damaging nature, in the Greek words — even three misprints in the English text — have been detected.

COSTAS M. PROUSSIS

ZVI ANKORI, *Karaites in Byzantium, the Formative Years, 970-1100*. Columbia University Press, New York, and The Weizmann Science Press of Israel, Jerusalem, 1959. Pp. xiv + 546. \$10.00.

This is a very careful and important piece of scholarship. The author has shown great industry in collecting the scattered

bits of information concerning the history in the Byzantine Empire of the Jewish sect of the Karaites. He has also shown great ingenuity in piecing together the bits he collected. His work affords us, for the first time, the main outlines of a reliable history of the Byzantine Karaite community, down to the beginning of the twelfth century. Such a history in outline is all the present sources will afford—some, indeed, would say it was more than the present sources will afford, and there is no denying that a number of the constructions which the present work sets before us are more or less speculative. But the speculation is carried on with admirable caution and clarity. The author has perfectly clear in his own mind, and makes perfectly clear to the reader, just where his evidence stops and his hypotheses begin.

It would be a pleasure to conclude the review with the above praise. Unfortunately, the potential pruchaser must be warned, in all fairness, that the book is so badly written that not many will find it pleasant reading. It takes for granted information the layman will not possess and explains at length details familiar to the expert and of interest only to him. It buries interesting original material in the footnotes (and often in Hebrew) and it fills the text with generalizations in pseudo-sociological jargon and arguments in the worst literary style of the *phudnik*. This is the greater pity because, as remarked above, the essential content of the work is potentially interesting and actually important.

MORTON SMITH

JOHN O. KALOGEROU, *Μαρία ἡ Ἀειπάρθενος Θεοτόκος κατὰ τὴν Ὁρθόδοξον πίστιν*, (Mary the Virgin Mother of God according to the Orthodox Faith). Thessalonica: M. Triantafyllou and Sons Press, 1957. Pp. 176.

The whole system of Mariology and Mariolatry which has been developed by the Roman Catholic Church on the one hand, and, on the other, the rejection by the Protestant theologians of the dogmatic substratum upon which the genuine Orthodox teaching concerning the person of Virgin Mary rests, has made the clear presentation of the Orthodox position, based on pure scholarly research and objective historical criteria, absolutely necessary. Dr. John Kalogerou, Professor of Historical Theology at the School of Theology of the University of Thessalonica, has admirably filled the vacuum with this monograph devoted to the

Orthodox teaching concerning Mary, the Virgin Mother of God. We must confess that Professor Kalogerou's book is actually the first more or less complete scholarly work of contemporary Greek Orthodox scholarship dedicated to the Virgin Mary. And one must credit the author, at the outset, with a unique contribution to an unexplored area of the Greek Orthodox Theology.

Professor Kalogerou follows the historic-dogmatic method of research. He thus examines the person of Mary in organic connection with Orthodox Christology, presenting the Orthodox teaching in its proper historical framework and on its genuine dogmatic basis. He also correctly warns his readers that the 'metathesis' of the 'center of gravity' from the Christological basis of the Orthodox teaching to an independent Mariology leads directly to the extremes of Roman Catholic Mariolatry. On the contrary, a weak and lukewarm Christology leads, automatically, to the depreciation of the person of the Virgin as happens, obviously, in the thought of Protestant theologians. The latter, reducing the person of Christ to that of a mere human being without the 'idiomata' of His divine nature, refuse, accordingly, to accept any rôle for the Virgin Mary in the soteriological scheme of Christ's advent.

Professor Kalogerou's main contribution lies chiefly in his positive and concrete presentation of the Greek Orthodox teaching. He presents the teaching of the Church as being well-founded on Biblical grounds, on the stratum of the Patristic thought, and on the 'praxis' of the liturgical life of the early Christian centuries. But his task does not stop here. He proceeds to a systematic study of all the debates and controversies focussed around the person of the Mother of God, and he points out the fact that most of those who have been condemned by the Church on account of their heretical teachings were at the same time deniers of the exceptional position which the Virgin Mary held in the theological and popular tradition (i.e. Docetists, Gnostics, Apollinarians, Nestorians, etc. See pp. 10 ff.) The Church, of course, fought from the very beginning against these abnormal theological distortions with theological, historical, and logical arguments (p. 14 ff.). Very characteristic, for instance, is the successful attempt of St. Irenaeus to base the Catholic teaching concerning the Virgin Mary on genuine soteriological grounds, as well as St. John Chrysostom's pertinent interpretation of St. Matthew's verse 1, 25. At this point Prof. Kalogerou refutes

H. Koch, the German scholar, whose main thesis is that no teaching concerning the Virginity of Mary can be found in the early literature of the Church. Moreover, the author reminds us that Origen already has used the term 'Theotokos' (*Contra Celsum* 1. 34-35), that most of the Fathers of the Church use the same term and without any hesitation render to the Virgin Mary a special honor and admiration, and that the decisions of the Ecumenical Synods concerning Christological doctrine are, at the same time, a recapitulation of the Catholic teaching of the Church concerning the person of the Virgin Mary. This fact is obvious. For the indispensable presupposition as far as the theological frame of the term 'Theotokos' is concerned, is the dogmatic principle of the communion or the 'antidosis' in Christ's 'idiomata.' The abandoning or the misapprehension of this principle leads to a Christological heresy as well as to the misrepresentation and misunderstanding of the Orthodox doctrine concerning the 'Theotokos.' The example of the erudite theologians of the School of Antioch and chiefly of Nestorius is indeed classic in this case. For this reason Prof. Kalogerou analyzes the Nestorian controversy extensively; and with strong arguments, based on scrupulous research, he shows that the renowned German scholar Ed. Schwartz was wrong in supporting the opinion that Nestorius has been unjustly condemned in the course of an ecclesiastico-political strife led by Cyril of Alexandria.

The author then proceeds to the examination of the later historico-dogmatic material; he places the Roman Catholic innovations concerning the 'immaculate conception,' as well as the recently proclaimed dogma of the Ascension of the Virgin Mary, under the definite censure of the Catholic Tradition. Professor Kalogerou proves easily the groundlessness of the contentions of Roman Catholic theologians both from the historical and theological point of view, since they lack any concrete Biblical and Patristic basis. Now what should one say in confronting the Roman Catholic assertions that, after all, Byzantine ecclesiastical figures like Isidore the Archbishop of Thessalonica during the fourteenth century and Nicholas Kabasilas of the same century present an affinity and a ground for the Latin dogmas? The author answers, correctly, that in reality the above-mentioned cases are exceptions which have been manifested under the influence of the scholastic theology of the West — more especially with Nicholas Kabasilas, whose teaching constitutes a 'peculiarity,' but

is in the last analysis, a 'theologoumenon' which deals rather with the precise time (that is, when exactly) the purification of the Virgin Mary took place. But as Prof. Kalogerou points out, Nicholas Kabasilas himself is not definite and specific as regards this problematic aspect of his 'theologoumenon.'

The author is eager to accept that in Orthodox Worship and Hymnology one can find some poetic or rhetoric expressions for the person of the Virgin Mary which by no means should be taken in a literal 'mariolatric' sense since the Orthodox Church has never adopted the thesis of the Roman Church that the Theotokos is a 'Mediatrix' or 'Corredemptrix' with her Son Jesus Christ. Prof. Kalogerou follows here the position of Prof. Karmires (who holds the chair of dogmatics at the School of Theology at the University of Athens), according to which not all the liturgical and hymnological texts of the Church should be freely used as sources of dogma precisely because of some exaggerated expressions of literal color which do not always present a careful wording of the Orthodox dogmas (pp. 107 ff.).

Prof. Kalogerou acknowledges the fact that there is a tendency among the ranking scholars of the Roman Catholic Church to justify the extremes of their Mariology and to offer a kind of 'compromising' attempts in order to enlighten the Christians outside the Roman flock. Professor Schmaus is an obvious example. His attempts and solutions do not find any response from the Orthodox theologians. Thus the author concludes his work with a fine appendix in which all the contemporary Orthodox literature is referred to and in which the position of the contemporary Orthodox theological thought concerning the Roman Catholic and the Protestant teaching is expounded more than successfully.

Without any hesitation one should note that Dr. Kalogerou's book is a constructive contribution to contemporary Greek Orthodox theology. An excellent scholar, a conscientious theologian, Prof. Kalogerou belongs to the brilliant young generation of Orthodox thinkers who have already begun to fill the higher academic chairs of theology in Athens and Thessalonica. He thus presents an admirable examination of sources and documents, a careful analysis of delicate dogmatic positions and an all-embracing view of the Christological doctrine of the Church which correctly considers as the stratum of the Orthodox basis of Mariology. An English translation should be contemplated, for

Prof. Kalogerou's work epitomizes comprehensively the whole teaching of the Church concerning the holy person of the Virgin Mary the Mother of God.

GEORGE S. BEBIS

DAVID TALBOT RICE, *The Art of Byzantium*. Photographs by Max Hirmer. London: Thames and Hudson, 1959. Pp. 348, 44 Colour and 196 Monochrome Plates, and 4 Text Figures.

Professor D. Talbot Rice, very well-known from his many books and studies on Byzantine art, is here concerned with the art of Byzantium proper, the art of Constantinople only. As he states in the Preface, 'both works on a large scale which are preserved in the city to this day, and small ones which there is, for one reason or another, good evidence to assign to Constantinople, are dealt with.' Of course, many Constantinopolitan works of art are not considered here, 'but an attempt has been made to include all the more important monuments of the city and the majority of the essentially typical ones from among the small things that are now to be found elsewhere.' Thus, architectural and sculptural works, mosaics, paintings, manuscript miniatures, ivory carvings, works in gold, silver, bronze, precious stones and silk, made and still existing in Constantinople or existing elsewhere but believed to have been made in Constantinople, are lavishly presented and expertly examined in this remarkable edition.

A comprehensive synthesis of the history of Byzantine art and its evolution is given in the first, main part, of Professor Rice's text, 'Byzantine Art, A Survey' (pp. 9-89). It forms a general but very informative, even at times detailed, introduction to Byzantine art, 'illustrating its various phases against their historical background.' The importance of Constantinople as the main center of Byzantine art is emphasized and explained through many examples and irrefutable evidences, though sometimes only through assumptions and inferences. This is especially true of the second part of the text, the 'Notes on the Plates' (pp. 287-388), where each of the 240 plates is discussed at great length. In the Notes, 'the descriptions of the plates are fairly full, and arguments as to dating or attribution to Constantinople rather than to some other center have been included in the descriptions.' As for the arrangement of the plates Professor Rice says: 'The plates have been arranged as nearly as possible in chronological

order, though exact sequence has sometimes been broken in order to effect stylistic comparisons or for technical reasons.'

This task has been accomplished with the utmost efficiency and expertness by Professor Rice. And although this book is concerned only with the art of Constantinople, yet it also gives a splendid picture of Byzantine art in general, of its æsthetic and inner values, of its character and style, and of its importance to its contemporary and later artistic creation. Time and again, Professor Rice points to the high quality of the works produced in Byzantium 'which have never since been equalled,' and asserts the 'great artistic pre-eminence' of the capital of Byzantine Empire. Even during the last centuries of the Byzantine Empire, when it was falling steadily into political, military, and financial decline, art was flourishing in Constantinople and continued to exert a great and beneficial influence on artistic development in Greece, the Balkans, Russia, and Italy. 'The clear-cut, precise style, the combination of stylization and naturalism, of straightforward representation and of spiritual feeling,' the religious spirit, the combination of transcendental outlook and vivid representation, the blend of the spiritual and the worldly, the 'balanced, even exquisite manner' of workmanship, the variety and sumptuousness of materials used, appear very early as the outstanding characteristics of Byzantine art and go through its entire history. Small things not less than large monuments were for the Byzantines vehicles for the interpretation of divine power, and for this reason were equally esteemed, revered and cherished. But, above all, originality and greatness characterize Byzantine art in all its periods. For instance, Professor Rice writes about St. Sophia of the sixth century: 'The conception of the building is thus original; even more, it is profoundly spiritual, and it is to be doubted whether a more successful combination of a practical building, capable of holding a mass of worshippers, and a transcendental understanding, where thoughts and emotions are at once wafted to a spiritual rather than a mundane sphere, has ever been achieved in the history of the world's architecture. In this *Sancta Sophia* remains supreme' (pp. 299 f.). And again, for the paintings of Kariye Cami of a much later period: 'The paintings must date from the first decade of the fourteenth century. At much the same date Giotto was decorating the Arena Chapel at Padua. The Byzantine painter had other ideas and a different outlook, but in his own way he was just as great a genius' (p. 84).

Therefore it is not without good reason that Professor Rice concludes his survey of Byzantine art as follows: 'Thus the story ends, with a decline, but not in insignificance. And if the art of the last phase was more limited in scope than that of Renaissance Italy, less personal than that of seventeenth-century France, less expressive than that of the Germany of Dürer, it was still an art of real consequence. It had inherited much of the mastery of technique, of the profound spiritual content, and of the austere beauty that characterized the earlier phases. It was, in the twelfth century, in many ways in advance of what was being done in Italy; in the early fourteenth century it was as good, though different. The major monuments are not easy of access; the smaller ones are unfamiliar, but it is hoped that the few examples that are illustrated here may serve at least to dispel the old conceptions that Byzantine art was at best monotonous, at worst of an inferior nature' (pp. 88 f.).

There is no doubt that at least this hope of Professor Rice has been successfully fulfilled by this superb book—if not indeed much more. The excellent color and monochrome photographs of Professor Max Hirmer have contributed a great deal to the artistic value of this impressive book, which is a work of love as much as a work of art and scholarship.

Two *lapsus calami* may be added to this brief note: First, though in both plates 97 and 149 ΕΤΔΟΚΙΑ and ΕΤΔΟΚΗΑ are clearly written for the names of the Empress and the Saint respectively, everywhere in the book this name is rendered in English 'Eudoxia' instead of the correct 'Eudocia.' In Byzantine history 'Eudoxia' is a different person. Secondly, on p. 310, in the description of Plates VIII, IX, 86, 87; and on p. 324, in the description of Plate XVII, it is stated that 'Solomon' anoints David instead of the correct 'Samuel.'

COSTAS M. PROUSSIS

A. M. ALLCHIN, *The Silent Rebellion: Anglican Religious Communities 1845-1900*. London: SCM Press, Ltd. Pp. 252, s. 25.

The life of 'the angelic pattern,' the absolute turning away from the world, the absolute focussing on God, has always been at the very core of the Church's being—is, indeed, her very backbone. In the first three centuries of their history, Christians did not, perhaps, have to struggle by specially-devised disciplines to

keep themselves from the world; by civil law they were forcibly excluded from it. But when the world accorded the Church a *modus vivendi* in St. Constantine's great benefactions, the difficulties that inevitably and ubiquitously beset life according to the angelic pattern took on a different character, and it was to meet this altered situation that monasticism, as we know it, came into being. This monasticism has remained at the heart of the Orthodox conception of the spiritual life ever since its evolution on the Egyptian desert, and must necessarily remain there as long as the Church enjoys relations with 'the world.'

By the summer of 1540, however, monastic life in all its forms had been blotted out in England. Whatever Henry VIII's motives may have been, his action had an effect on the spiritual direction of Anglicanism that was decisive for the three centuries following. The pious household at Little Gidding, cut off by the Civil War, led to no enduring tradition of cloistered families; and occasional writings arguing the (usually practical) advantages that might accrue from a 'reformed' conventional life found little response. It was only under Victoria, in a world that seemed barren of religious possibilities, that conventional life emerged, or reëmerged, in the English Church. And it did so against what seemed the insurmountable odds of both popular and episcopal prejudice and hostility.

The Silent Rebellion is a history of the partial recovery of the angelic life by the Church of England. Briefly surveying English attitudes towards monasticism from the time of Henry VIII to 1800, Mr. Allchin proceeds to explore the rise of the conventional 'sisterhoods' in the mid-nineteenth century, presents documents illustrative of the Establishment's gradual acceptance of and reconciliation to the ideas inherent in this movement, and finally gives examples of the state of Anglican monastic affairs at the close of the century. A fair amount of hitherto unpublished material is included.

The reasons for this reëmergence of conventional life are difficult to isolate. The most conspicuous and broadly influential force, naturally, was the itself inexplicable and many-sided Oxford Movement; but the general socio-economic condition of Victorian England—the conventional status of women, the acute conflict between class interests, the rifts already apparent in western industrial civilization—also played a decisive rôle. Mr. Allchin has done valuable work in relating the conventional

reëmergence to the feminist sentiments that had begun to circulate at the time. For it was with the charitable 'sisterhood' that the movement finally gained, and held, its place in the English Church. They were the pioneers, and their every step had to be fought for. The conventional life was first defended on the grounds of its social utility; only afterwards, and then hesitantly, was the devout life in itself admitted to be its true *raison d'être*.

The Romantic Movement also played a considerable part in this reëmergence, though not always a fortunate one. It is to be regretted that Mr. Allchin does not enter into this aspect of his subject. The true substance of the cloistered life had often to be disentangled from a good deal of Gothic *chichi* — the more so because these people were feeling their way through strange territories with guides not always trustworthy. But it was only the austereley devoted who held fast: Pusey, Benson, Frere, the many figures who wore the habit in silence and anonymity.

Mr. Allchin's terminal date, 1900, is arbitrary and unfortunate. The book was originally written as a B.Litt. thesis for the University of Oxford, and suffers from a lack of recasting. The first section, dealing with the foundation of the sisterhoods, is a coherent and often illuminating study; the second is basically no more than a collection of sources, and the third a gathering of miscellaneous information to no very clear purpose. Nevertheless, in spite of its faults, the book contributes much to the understanding of what is perhaps the most remarkable phenomenon that has taken place in the English Church since the Reformation — namely, a Counter Reformation.

The Orthodox reader will note, however, that the conventional orders suppressed by Henry VIII were not, in the Orthodox conception of the term, strictly monastic. He might recognize the Carthusians as such, and possibly certain among the many Cistercian houses. By far the greater number, however, were in their basic scheme charitable institutions, dedicated to performing works of mercy, or to the active advancement of the Church's mission. It is not surprising that the English conventional orders as now revived have much the same character. What is surprising, to the Orthodox eye, is that the leaders of this 'reëmergence' have more often than not chosen to imitate contemporary Roman Catholic models. The distinguished Anglican liturgist Gregory Dix, late Abbot of Nashdom, himself proved repeatedly that ritual forms trivial in themselves often have far-reaching and

unexpectedly important effects on the worshipper's spirituality and belief. How much more, then, shall a whole way of life? In taking her paradigms from the recent fiats of Rome rather than from the continuous and living traditions of the Fathers, *Ecclesia Anglicana* runs a grave risk. Instead of being identified with the Church Catholic, as she devoutly hopes, she may find that she is no more than an echo—a non-papal indeed, but nevertheless merely Roman, similitude of 'Catholicism.'

RICHARD STOCKTON

JAROSLAV PELICAN, *The Riddle of Roman Catholicism*. New York and Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1959. Pp. 272. \$4.00.

The student of Eastern Orthodox Christian Theology approaches this book with some embarrassment. The book in hand is part of an increasing conversation between Roman Catholic and Protestant theologians. The Eastern Orthodox Christian thus approaches such a conversation as a third party; he cannot help but sense, on the one hand, that he is overhearing a conversation of no direct interest to him, yet, on the other, he finds that in a book such as this many of the topics discussed are very familiar. In fact the book in hand is a book easily read by the Eastern Orthodox reader, because the categories and areas of theological concern are those traditionally examined by Eastern Orthodox Theology. Much of what is written today and which passes for theology in all camps is oftentimes of a greatly different character.

The author, a professor of historical theology at the Federated Theological Faculty of the University of Chicago, divides his study of the riddle of Roman Catholicism into three parts. The first is an historical examination of the development of the Roman Catholic Church. Here the author presents the thesis that catholicism was implicit in the New Testament, and that it may be defined as identity (the exclusive Christian message) and universality (the appeal to the whole world). These two, in proper balance, form the essence of catholicity. It is interesting to the Eastern Orthodox reader that the crucial point of the description of this concept of catholicity is a quotation from Alexie Khomakov (p. 25). This concept of catholicity underlies the whole book, being the foundation of both appreciation and criticism of the Roman Church. In the second section, entitled 'The Genius of Roman Catholicism,' he discusses the place of Peter in the

Catholic Church; the authority, obedience, and jurisdiction pertaining to the person of Peter. This section is perhaps the most objectionable from the Eastern Orthodox point of view. Further in the second section he makes a relatively detailed examination of the Roman Catholic theory and practice regarding the doctrine of the two realms, the Sacraments, the person of the Theotokos, Thomism, cultus and culture. Questions of division, unity, and union mark the last section of the book, entitled 'A Theological Approach to Roman Catholicism.' In it, common roots are emphasized, the type of unity sought delineated (recognition of differences, reform on both sides, recognition of the witnesses of both Roman and Reformation traditions), the rejection of conversion as a true solution to the problem of disunity, the affirmation that the only hope lies in the area of continued conversation between themselves on unofficial levels in which 'gentle and firm testimony' (p. 217) is shared by the participants.

The Eastern Orthodox Christian, having overheard this side of the conversation, must necessarily take exception to some of the statements, attitudes, and presuppositions. Of course, the evolutionary view of the development of the Church and her institutions causes raised eyebrows for the Eastern Orthodox Christian, e.g., the ministry *becoming* a priesthood, the Church *becoming* catholic. These are concepts hardly acceptable to either Eastern or Western Church.

Again, the exclusive credit given to Leo of Rome for the Orthodoxy of Chalcedon not only overlooks historical facts, but also ignores the concept of the function of the Ecumenical Synod at that time and at present (p. 38); the flat statement that the Pope of Rome invalidated Photius' ordination (p. 43), and the explanation that the place of the supreme Pontiff was necessitated because of the contradictions in tradition, hardly do justice to the Eastern Orthodox position. Another unfortunate point is the use of the word 'caesaropapism' as a description of the relations of Church and State in Byzantium. This word has ceased to express what scholars now know of that relationship. (For similar comment, see review of *The Byzantine World*, J. M. Hussey in *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, Vol. xi, No. 1.) Finally, in the admittedly sketchy review of the Sacraments, the criticisms of the Sacraments of Confirmation and Extreme Unction unwittingly justify and support, in part, the Eastern Orthodox position on these Sacraments (pp. 115, 121). But the infor-

mation regarding the rôle of the Bishop in Confirmation (p. 115) needs revision.

However, in listening to this conversation between Roman Catholic and Protestant, the Eastern Orthodox Christian hears much that he can applaud and some by which he can profit. The sections on the Priesthood (pp. 85 f.), the Theotokos (pp. 238-242), the Word and the Sacrament (p. 127), the Greek Fathers (p. 155), the pertinent 'presidential question' (p. 106) are genuine attempts of a Protestant to understand, appreciate and, even on occasion, to describe that which is alien to his own position. The author has done a remarkable job. The most sympathetic and appreciative chapter this reviewer finds to be the one on 'Cultus and Culture.' In it the author sees the need of the liturgical church to make worship real to the worshipper and relevant to the contemporary social *milieu*. His concept of catholicity seems to be a welcome revision of Ernst Troeltsch's Church and Sect Type classifications. It gives a more meaningful understanding to the Church-type. Finally, in appreciation, it is to be noted that the author has written in a most fair manner, has avoided the temptation to criticize for criticism's sake, has presented an attempt at constructive criticism balanced by sincere appreciation for much in Roman Catholicism, and has performed the task of a self-critic for Protestantism in a sober manner. Author Pelikan is to be congratulated for this effort.

THE REV. STANLEY S. HARAKAS

D. F. HUDSON, *Teach Yourself New Testament Greek*. New York: Association Press, 1960. Pp. xiv and 178.

This small book purposes to make its reader teach himself New Testament Greek in 28 lessons and as painlessly as possible. It follows closely the method used and the innovations introduced by F. Kinchin Smith and T. W. Melhuish in their *Kepos—Greek in Two Years* (London: English Universities Press, 1951), or rather the prototype of the latter, *Teach Yourself Greek*, by the same authors. Mr. Hudson even uses on pp. 108-111 their puerile pictures for the teaching of the use of prepositions. Thus this book has not much originality, nor does it improve nor succeed in making really painless the learning of New Testament Greek. On the contrary, the many mistakes in syntax (for instance, in several of the made-up Greek examples), in grammar

and vocabulary, and other mistakes, together with the abolition of accents advocated and practised in the book, make its use difficult and of doubtful advantage to anyone.

The author wanted his book not to be dull — and perhaps he has attained this end by his questionable 'humor' sprinkled here and there and by his lack of scholarly accuracy in many instances; but, of course, these qualities do not commend this book to any serious student of New Testament Greek. Quite the opposite: while it may seduce some uninitiated persons to the adornment of themselves with some muddled knowledge of New Testament Greek, it will, certainly, hinder or mislead those intending to become better acquainted with the language so that they may read fluently, understand, and appreciate the Old and New Testaments, the Apostolic Fathers, and the great Fathers of the Church. Particularly, the abolition of the accents is a major mistake of the book. For accent has had great importance in the Greek language during all its periods and stages: from the Mycenaean Greek of Linear B through Homer, through ancient dialects and classical Greek, through *Koiné* and Byzantine Greek, up to the Modern, contemporary Greek language. For instance, while there are no breathings or distinctions between long and short vowels in Modern Greek (and in this regard, they began to lose their force even before *Koiné*), yet, the accent, though different in character, still keeps its full force and plays a decided rôle in Modern Greek. Of course, many classical and New Testament scholars forget that the Greek language has never stopped to exist in both written and spoken forms, and they do not bother to learn and acquaint themselves with its later stages, especially with its living form today. This is about as fatal a mistake as was the erroneous opinion up to two or three generations ago that the language of New Testament was a corrupted form of ancient Greek, a form without grammar and syntax, not worth serious linguistic study.

How can the student of this book learn to pronounce Greek words correctly when he is not advised on which syllable the accent falls? How can he distinguish between words written with the same letters but different in meaning on account of their different accentuation? For the importance of accent is not only for the orthography of the words, but much more for their formation and derivation and for the difference in their meaning. One may cite, for instance, only a few pairs of words with the same

letters but different meanings. Both words in a pair or at least one word of each pair are taken from the book of Mr. Hudson: ὁ and ὅ, εἰ and εῖ, ἦν and Ἰν, τίς and τις, γράφων and γραφῶν, νόμος and νομός, ψύχη and ψυχή, χείρων and χειρῶν, φίλου and φιλοῦ, φιλήσαι and φιλῆσαι, δούλου and δουλοῦ, τήρει and τηρεῖ, παιδία and παιδιά, ἀμπέλων and ἀμπελῶν, φίλων and φιλῶν, δούλων and δουλῶν, ἄρω and ἄρω, εἰμι and εἰμί, μένω, μένεις, μένει, μένουσι and μενῶ, μενεῖς, μενεῖ, μενοῦσι — and legions of others. There is no doubt that the context in which these words appear helps to decide their correct meaning, but why deprive the student of a ready and safe hint for their proper distinction?

Of course, the ancient and New Testament Greeks did not use any signs of accents when writing their language, but they did not use the signs of breathing either, nor did they use small letters or punctuation marks. They even wrote the words continuously, without separating one word from another. Do we have to turn back to that imperfect stage of writing in order to satisfy Mr. Hudson and his adage, 'if that was good enough for the ancient and New Testament Greeks, it is good enough for us'?

Of the many other mistakes of the book, not counting the misprints, one may refer to only a few: It was not 'a German scholar named Deissmann' who first made the truth about Koine and New Testament Greek known (p. xi), but several decades before him the great Greek linguist George N. Hatzidakis. (Again, the ignorance of Modern Greek language, culture, and scholarship beclouds the vision of many a Western scholar—even though, in this instance, Hatzidakis wrote the results of his linguistic researches in the German language as well as in Modern Greek.) No Greek of any period could say for 'The garment is on the teacher' «Τὸ ἱμάτιόν ἔστιν ἐπὶ τῷ διδασκάλῳ», (p. 8. Of course, there are no accents in the book for these and the following Greek words.) There is no Greek word, ancient or modern, Τηλεφωνή, (p. 10). "Εμφασις is not from 'root φα- "speak"' (p. 11), *i.e.*, from φημί, but from ἐμφαίνω. On p. 35 Mr. Hudson writes: 'The Greeks did not like the pronunciation of σ after these letters [*i.e.*, λ, μ, ν, ο], so the σ was dropped,' etc. This may be true for the combination -μσ-, but what about ἄλσος, ἔνσημον, ἄρσις, ἔπαρσις, ἐγρήγορσις, χεοσί (pp. 42, 45, 152), σωτῆροι (p. 40), and many other Greek words? The word ἥχος 'sound' is not neuter τὸ ἥχος as is written in pp. 73 and 167, but masculine ὥχος. There is no Greek word πανόπλιον 'armour' (pp. 91, 158,

169, 172), but πανόπλια, ἵ. (Here the mistake of Mr. Hudson came, I presume, because he wrote πανόπλια, without accent, and thought that it was a neutral plural τὰ πανόπλια, and thus he coined a non-existent τὸ πανόπλιον. It is the fatal result of his abolition of the accents.) On p. 99 in a note on τοῖς φίλοισι he wrongly states, 'In poetry the dative plural sometimes has an ι added to help the metre.'

COSTAS M. PROUSSIS

BOOK NOTES

W. K. C. GUTHRIE, *The Greek Philosophers, from Thales to Aristotle.*
New York: Harper Torchbook, The Academy Library, 1960. Pp. 168.
\$95.

This little book is an ideal introduction for the general reader into the world of ancient philosophy. It is a reprint of a book published, in 1950, by the Philosophical Library, New York, and well deserves a large public; but it is well suited to interest particularly those readers who are familiar with the traditions of the Greek Orthodox faith, though they will have to find for themselves the particular lines of thought that link the pagan with the Christian developments, since it concludes with Aristotle.

Professor Guthrie has long been known at Cambridge University, and more recently in other parts of the world, as one of the most stimulating writers and speakers on ancient Greek philosophy. He was a pupil of the late F. M. Cornford, whose *The Unwritten Philosophy and Other Essays* he edited, and whom he succeeded as Laurence Professor of Ancient Philosophy at Cambridge. In his own right he has written *The Greeks and Their Gods*, and *Orpheus and Greek Religion, A Study of the Orphic Movement*; in 1957 he delivered the Messenger Lectures at Cornell University, on *In the Beginning: Early Greek Views on the Origin of Life and Civilization*, since published by the Cornell University Press. The present writer heard these lectures, as did a large and enthusiastic audience; they are as good to enjoy in print as they were good to hear. Professor Guthrie is now also the Master of Downing College, Cambridge.

The Greek Philosophers contains much familiar material, but is no ordinary compendium of information. Rather it shows the novice how to step from our age into a different intellectual climate. Thus the first chapter, 'Greek Ways of Thinking,' is pedagogy of a high order, showing, for example, what a difference it makes for our understanding of familiar English terms like 'justice,' 'virtue,' and 'god,' often used in philosophical or even in general contexts, to realize how they, or their equivalents, came to be used in early Greek society. The remaining chapters deal with 'Matter and Form (Ionians and Pythagoreans)', 'The Problem of Motion (Heraclitus, Parmenides, and the Pluralists)', 'The Reaction Toward Humanism (The Sophists and Socrates)', 'Plato: The Doctrine of Ideas,' 'Plato: Ethical and Theological Answers to the Sophists,' 'Aristotle: The Aristotelian Universe,' and 'Aristotle: Human Beings.' No attempt is made to carry the account beyond Aristotle, and references to later European thought are few; the reader must bridge the gap for himself. The influence of Cornford is felt at many points; but the admirable organization, the selection of topics for emphasis, the clarity of expressions,

the occasional warnings that it is possible to hold another opinion than the one presented, are all Guthrie's. A few 'Suggestions for Further Reading' fill the last two pages.

Though intended for the general reader, even the experienced student will find this book of service in reminding him of major issues in Greek philosophic thought within the period that it covers, and therefore of the germs of much later thought.

WILLIAM C. GREENE

J. N. THEODORACOPOULOS, *Plato, Plotinus, Origenes*. Athens, 1959. Pp. 79.

This small booklet, written in Modern Greek by Professor J. N. Theodoracopoulos, is a very brief account of the lives and systems of Plato, Plotinus, and Origen. In spite of its brevity, however, it is a welcome addition to Modern Greek philosophical literature, because, on the one hand, it presents the basic elements and the most important points of the lives and systems of the three philosophers in a clear, precise and methodical way, and on the other it shows the dependence on, and/or the points of relation of the two last philosophers to Plato, their great predecessor.

In comparison to the other two parts, the first part, on Plato, is the longer, as one might properly expect from Professor Theodoracopoulos, who is the most articulate interpreter of Plato in Greece today. Plato's life is carefully delineated and meaningfully interpreted in relation to his times and work; and although in the exposition of Plato's system much remains to be desired (for instance, Plato's theories on state, art, love, and other subjects), yet the most important elements of Platonic philosophy, especially those concerning dialectic, ideas and soul, and their development and interrelation, are clearly and comprehensively presented in Professor Theodoracopoulos' treatment.

The same careful examination characterizes the treatment of Plotinus and Origen, though one would wish a more thorough and complete examination of the systems of these two philosophers especially, for many reasons, but primarily because the relative literature in Modern Greece is almost non-existent, except for one or two essays on Plotinus by the same author.

Some misprints and other inadvertences appear in the book. Of these the most important are on p. 22, Σκέψιν instead of Σκέψιν, and on p. 61 the dates for Eusebius 260-40 A.D. instead of 260-340 A.D.

COSTAS M. PROUSSIS

R. H. S. CROSSMAN, M.P., *Plato Today*, Revised Edition. New York: Oxford University Press, 1959. Pp. 215. \$4.00.

This is as brilliant and exciting a book as it was when it was originally published in 1937. It is written with great wit, enthusiasm, and vigor, and caused a good deal of criticism, both favorable and unfavorable,

when it was originally published. This revised edition is a reprint of the original edition with a new introduction, a new chapter (11) entitled 'The Modern Plato Once More,' a few changes in the chapter 'Plato Looks at British Education,' and the omission of the chapter 'Plato Looks at the New Deal.'

Mr. Crossman looks upon Plato as an authoritarian dogmatist of limited vision, who tried to impose his own aristocratic bias on an impractical political philosophy and who himself was a failure as a would-be politician. In this light the *Republic* thus becomes a handbook for aspiring dictators, no matter how good or enlightened or progressive their intentions; the Academy an institution for counter-revolutionaries.

Crossman's chapters on how Plato would view certain modern institutions and theories is undoubtedly the most fascinating and most brilliant part of his book (democracy, education, the family, Communism, Fascism, Naziism). His reaction to Plato's *Republic* ('The more I read it, the more I hate it.' p. 190) is extreme and violent and really unjustified in view of Crossman's own brilliant portraiture of Plato's genius. Crossman's book was responsible for a revaluation of Plato as a political thinker and his own attack on the idealistic but dangerous Plato was followed by the violent attacks of K. R. Popper (*The Open Society and Its Enemies*) and others.

Yet Plato himself clearly states that he never intended his *Republic* to be more than an ideal, 'a pattern laid up in Heaven.'

'Perhaps there is a pattern laid up in heaven for the man who is willing to see and seeing, to establish a city himself. *It makes no difference whether it exists somewhere or will exist.* For whatever he should do would be characteristic of this city alone; it would be characteristic of no other.' (*Republic* ix.592b2-5)

Plato Today is still fascinating reading in spite of the extreme attack that it makes on the person of Plato himself in its fervent attempt to defend democracy against all criticism. Yet Crossman exaggerates Plato to produce the desired effect of discrediting Plato. For Crossman Plato's dogmatic philosophy was nothing more than a reaction 'trying vainly to explain the new epoch in terms of the old, and to torture a new society into the strait-waistcoat of an outworn code.' 'Plato was forced to destroy that freedom without which reason must die, and with irrefutable logic he will defend a *status quo* in which the seeds of revolution are watered by the self-righteous opposition of the educated classes to social change.' (p. 192) Plato, according to Crossman, was an unmitigated snob, who disliked the riffraff and thought them too stupid to be capable of self-government. 'By asserting the existence of an absolute truth, it gave to a dying order the trappings of eternal verity. It did not discover anything new, but rationalized into a formal system a set of partisan prejudice. For this reason it contributed nothing to the solution of the problems of Plato's own age.' (p. 192)

Crossman sets Plato up in the modern world where he has him criticize modern institutions and practices in a Platonic way. Then Crossman attacks Plato for not understanding modern democracy and its institutions

and for believing in the 'dictatorship of the good.' Yet much bitter truth comes out of this criticism of the moderns.

This book is a fascinating *tour de force* but a *tour de force* it remains. With all its brilliance this book only serves to show what an even more brilliant person Plato was. The reader will enjoy this book and Plato will become even more important and more sensible to him after reading *Plato Today*.

JOHN E. REXINE

CHARLES ALEXANDER ROBINSON, JR., *Athens in the Age of Pericles*. The Centers of Civilization Series. Norman, Oklahoma: University of Oklahoma Press, 1959. Pp. 165. \$2.75.

This attractive thin volume is the first in a projected series of volumes to be published by the University of Oklahoma Press on 'cities which, from the earliest times to the present, have exercised a radiating influence upon the civilization in which they have existed.' *The Centers of Civilization Series* aims, according to the publishers, 'to avoid synoptic history at the one pole and political and military preoccupation at the other, save in those instances where war was the accompaniment of life in almost every decade. A picture of the people, their devotion to the literatures, arts, religion, sciences, engineering, and administration which made them influential, is the principal objective of volumes in *The Center of Civilization Series*.'

It is important to know the purpose of such a series if one is to judge fairly whether the first volume (which should presumably give some indication of what to look forward to in the succeeding volumes) has met these objectives. A reading of Professor Robinson's volume, *Athens in the Age of Pericles*, will be a source of considerable disappointment to those who expect a penetrating analysis of the unique brilliance of the Athenian contribution to civilization. Only the first two chapters ('Strife, Faith, and Liberality,' and 'The Strength of the Democracy') show Professor Robinson at his best and give the reader any kind of analytical study of the Athenian achievement. The remaining five chapters ('An Imperial Democracy,' 'Art and Thought,' 'Life,' 'War,' 'The Future') are nothing more than a collection of easily available selections from Herodotus, Thucydides, Xenophon, the 'Old Oligarch,' Aeschylus, and Sophocles, and Plutarch with very little substantive commentary. The Selected Bibliography is a very good one for the general reader and the index is slight.

It is difficult to see the justification for making a limited anthology of Greek literature out of a book that was presumably intended to concentrate on a well-rounded picture of the Athenian accomplishment. It is undoubtedly true that to recreate the Athenian world of the Fifth Century in anything like an original or new way is a thankless if not hopeless task. But it seems reasonable that the reader should expect more analysis, more interpretation, more in the nature of a synthetic picture of Periclean Athens in a book of this sort. Judicious use of selections from Greek literature is useful when these serve an avowed purpose, but this book

was not supposed to be an anthology. The general reader will find very little value in such extended quotations removed from their context and presented to the reader inexperienced in Greek things with such brief and inadequate commentary.

This book unfortunately fails to achieve the stated objectives of the Series except in the most general and roundabout way, in spite of Professor Robinson's promise 'to catch a general notion of the significance of the whole and moreover, if at all possible, to explain why it was Athens that became pre-eminent in contemporary Greece.' (p. ix) Nevertheless, the book is an interesting if unsuccessful experiment in anthologizing as a technique for introducing the reader into the essence of a civilization.

JOHN E. REXINE

ANDRÉ GRABAR and MANOLIS CHATZIDAKIS, *Greece: Byzantine Mosaics*. (Volume XIII in the UNESCO World Art Series). Greenwich, Connecticut; New York Graphic Society, 1959. Pp. 26, 32 color plates. \$18.00

This is truly a spectacular art book, 13½" by 19" with 32 magnificent full page plates of mosaic art works from Thessaloniki, Daphni, Chios, and the monastery of Hosios Loukas in Phokis, dating from the fifth to the fourteenth centuries in addition to four black and white illustrations.

This beautiful volume is another in the UNESCO World Art Series containing a selection of rare and lovely works from the mosaic art of mediaeval Greece, presented for the first time in book form. In its aim to present something of the art heritage of Christian Greece this volume serves powerfully to demonstrate the full splendor of the Byzantine Christian tradition by artists whose mastery of this form of art has never been excelled.

The usual art volumes have examples of Byzantine mosaics from Constantinople and vicinity, but this unusual volume is limited to samples from Greece with examples of almost every category of mural mosaics from the fifth to the fourteenth centuries which have been preserved in Greece. In the case of the first period or so-called early Christian period (5th to 8th centuries) the only example missing is one of the two Nikopolis portraits, but this is more than made up for by the inclusion of a lovely head from the rotunda of St. George reproduced here in color for the first time (Pl. II). Also omitted are a few Byzantine mosaics proper, particularly those of St. Sophia in Thessaloniki, those fairly inaccessible ones of Vatopedi on Mount Athos, those of Serres where only one figure has been preserved, and the *Pantokrator* and *Prophets* in the dome of the church of the Parigoritissa at Arta of the 13th Century. In spite of these omissions, which Professor Chatzidakis does not fail to mention in his text (p. 15), the volume remains an exceptional pictorial record of Byzantine Greek mosaic art of the most intense and exciting kind.

This beautiful book gives due prominence to the three principal categories of 11th century mosaics which represent the peak of Byzantine

Greek mosaic art. The monastic churches concerned are all in rural areas. The oldest of these is Hosios Loukas in a high valley in Phokis near Delphi. The second chronologically is the 'New Monastery' on the island of Chios; and the third is Daphni near Athens on the road to Eleusis. The texts of André Grabar and Manolis Chatzidakis are clear, simple introductions to the art concerned, and together with a very adequate bibliography and table of contents, provide the reader with an excellent introduction to the reproductions of the art objects themselves.

This collection of plates of Byzantine mosaic art will convince any reader of the vitality and excellence of Byzantine mosaic art and will introduce him to some of the greatest art treasures in the history of the world.

JOHN E. REXINE

DAVID TALBOT RICE, *Masterpieces of Byzantine Art*. Edinburgh, The University Press, 1958 (in the United States distributed by Quadrangle Books, Inc., Chicago, Illinois). Pp. 93. 15 plates. \$3.00.

This book is essentially the catalogue of the Exhibition of Byzantine Art held by the Edinburgh Festival Society in 1958 under the organizing direction of Professor and Mrs. D. T. Rice. Some 254 items of Byzantine art were displayed, with objects dating from the beginning of the fourth century and proceeding as far down as the seventeenth century. This exhibition of Byzantine art was the first such organized exhibition of Byzantine art on British soil. Objects were loaned for the occasion from Belgium, Britain, Cyprus, France, Germany, Greece, Holland, the Vatican, Italy, Spain, Switzerland, Turkey, the U.S.S.R., and Yugoslavia. Conspicuously absent were any lenders from the United States.

The exhibition was not aimed merely at specialists, though they undoubtedly manifested great interest and pride in this exhibition of Byzantine art. The general intelligent viewer was also kept in mind. The exhibition was meant to have general appeal as well as specific interest. 'But its appeal will, it is hoped, be wider, for it will bring before the public an art which, in the richness of its material, the finish of its craftsmanship, in its profound artistic quality, and in its deep spiritual character, remains virtually unequalled among the arts of the past, while it is also surely not out of sympathy with some of the best of what is being done to-day.' (p. 8) The preceding is an appraisal of and tribute to Byzantine art by Professor Rice in his short essay at the beginning of the catalogue.

Masterpieces of Byzantine Art is unfortunately only a catalogue without more than fifteen fine black and white reproductions of the art objects originally exhibited. It would have been an exceptional experience had this book contained color reproductions of all the objects exhibited at this historical exhibition of Byzantine art. It is hoped that the fine example of the Edinburgh exhibition will inspire others to promote large scale exhibitions of Byzantine art elsewhere throughout the world.

JOHN E. REXINE

PLATO, *Gorgias*. Translated with an Introduction by W. Hamilton. Baltimore, Maryland: Penguin Books, 1960. Pp. 149. Paperbound. \$95.

This is another new translation in the splendid Penguin classics series edited by E. V. Rieu. Plato's *Gorgias* has long been a famous and controversial dialogue. It is perhaps best known for Callicles' defense and positing of the 'might makes right' argument, which is taken up again by Thrasymachus in Book I of Plato's *Republic*. Socrates' refutation of this argument is perhaps as much a classic as is Callicles' statement of the Nietzsche-like proposition.

This dialogue is a bitter one, opposed to the Sophists, opposed to the Sophists' favorite product, oratory (which Socrates describes as the knack of panders), opposed bitterly to democracy, but a dialogue in strong support of justice. The dialogue is centered around the Socratic theme that it is better to suffer wrong than to do wrong and one passage from W. Hamilton's new translation will serve to illustrate the seemingly paradoxical central theme of the dialogue as well as the excellence of Hamilton's translation:

'I maintain, Callicles, that it is not being slapped on the face undeservedly, nor yet being wounded in my body or my purse that is the ultimate disgrace, and that it is more harmful as well as more disgraceful to strike and wound me and mine wrongfully; and that to rob me or enslave me or break into my house or, generally speaking, to inflict any wrong upon me and mine brings more harm and disgrace upon the wrong-doer than upon me who suffers the wrong.' (Penguin translation, p. 119)

W. Hamilton has produced an eminently readable translation of a Platonic classic.

JOHN E. REXINE

C. KERENYI, *The Gods of the Greeks*. Translated from the German by Norman Cameron. New York: Grove Press, Inc., 1960. First Evergreen Edition. Illustrated. Pp. xvi, 304. \$1.95.

Professor Kerenyi's *The Gods of the Greeks* is a very useful book, but its title can be deceiving. This is not a book concerned with ancient Greek theology; it is simply a re-telling of myths from Greek antiquity centering upon tales of the gods for the most part. Men and heroes are not dealt with except incidentally. Professor Kerenyi, a classical scholar of international reputation, has striven to give the *adult* reader a mature re-telling of Greek mythology, bearing in mind contemporary man's interest in and awareness of modern psychology. Psychologists probe back into a man's subconscious past. Mythology manifests in pictorial literary and religious form an externalization of a people's psyche.

The Gods of Greece is 'an experimental attempt to translate the mythology of the Greeks back, to some extent at least, into its original medium, into mythological story-telling.' (p. 4) In accordance with this aim, Professor Kerenyi has re-organized Greek mythology in chronological sequence, following as closely as possible the original texts of the Greek

stories in the first person, as if they were being related by a Greek narrator. *Mythologia* is thus interpreted in its original sense, 'a story that is told.' 'The original story-tellers of Greek mythology justified their variations simply with the act of narration, each in his own fashion, of the story. In mythology, to tell is to justify.' (p. 9)

In this way Professor Kerenyi hopes to make the myths come alive again for the modern reader. In fifteen well-packed chapters the reader is introduced to Greek versions of the beginning of things, stories of the Titans, the Moirai, Hekate, and other pre-Olympian deities, Aphrodite, the Great Mother of the Gods and her companions, Zeus and his various consorts, Metis and Pallas Athene, Leto, Apollo, Artemis, Hera, Ares, Hephaistos, Maia, Hermes, Pan, the Nymphs, Poseidon and his various wives, the sun, moon, and their family, Prometheus and the human race, Hades and Persephone, and Dionysos and his female companions. Original Greek literary sources for the myths are constantly cited, photogravure plates and black and white drawings appropriately illustrate the text, and an index of proper and geographical names and Greek terms make the book eminently usable.

Kerenyi's *Gods of the Greeks* is not a particularly penetrating book. It does not contain a single analysis, psychological or otherwise, of any Greek myth, but it does provide the adult reader with a well-organized and accurately documented re-telling of the famous Greek myths about their gods, a knowledge of which will provide the general reader with valuable information on a mythology that lies at the very base of our Western culture.

JOHN E. REXINE

W. GERSON RABINOWITZ, *Aristotle's Protrepticus and the Sources of Its Reconstruction*. (University of California Publications in Classical Philology, Vol. 16, No. 1). Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1957. Pp. 96. \$2.00.

This is the first of two investigations into the *testimonia* and fragments of the *Protrepticus*. The title of this work is cited in the catalogues of Aristotle's writings preserved by Diogenes Laërtius, Hesychius, and Ptolemaeus. The title is also referred to in an extract in Stobæus and in specific references by Aphrodisias, Elias, David, Olympiodorus, and by an anonymous Aristotelian scholiast. The book seems to have been addressed to a Cypriot king called Themison and was an exhortation to the young to study philosophy. The work itself is no longer extant.

The preservation of the mere title of this Aristotelian title has not prevented scholars from trying to reconstruct the work, with some arguing that it was a dialogue, others that it was a rhetorical piece. One scholar (J. Bernays) has even claimed that a large portion of Iamblichus' *Protrepticus* was an excerpt from Aristotle. Another scholar (Bywater in 1869) encouraged interest in reconstructing Aristotle's lost *Protrepticus* by suggesting that Cicero used the Aristotelian work as a model for his *Hortensius*. The result was intensive searching into the extant writings of the Stoics, the Epicureans, Cicero, Seneca, Plutarch, the Neo-Platonists, the early Christian writers, and others for fragments of the *Protrepticus*.

The work of subsequent scholars has tended to increase the body of the *Protrepticus* with the consequence that many scholars are even falling into the error of accepting these reconstructions as the original Aristotelian work.

Professor Rabinowitz reexamines all the references to the *Protrepticus* in the ancient sources and the reconstructions of scholars like Bernays, Bywater, Hirzel, and Rose and finds no evidence for such a positive reconstruction and warns the reader to beware of these hypothetical reconstructions. At present, Professor Rabinowitz emphasizes, there is no evidence to support such sweeping reconstructions:

'But so far as we can see at present, we shall *not* know, or be deluded into thinking that we know, when the work was written, what its form, its length, its contents, its purpose and significance were, what its relation to Platonism, Isocrateanism, Epicureanism, and early Christian thought was, whether or not it was a manifesto on behalf of Plato's school and philosophy, and what place it assumed in the development of Aristotle's thought (if, indeed, that thought underwent a development).' (p. 95)

Professor Rabinowitz intends to carry his research further on this subject but he is convinced that the conclusions about the possibility of a real reconstruction of this lost work of Aristotle will be negative.

JOHN E. REXINE

MOSES HADAS, *Hellenistic Culture: Fusion and Diffusion*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1959. Pp. 324. \$6.00.

This magnificent volume by the Jay Professor of Greek at Columbia University, Dr. Moses Hadas, adds yet another volume to the long and respected list of publications this great American scholar has made available to the reading public. In *Hellenistic Culture* Professor Hadas has given us a book in an area in which he is particularly interested and a field for which he is particularly well equipped for probing analysis.

The Hellenistic period for Professor Hadas is no less glorious than the traditional classical but serves to show the dual aspect of the Greek miracle. Not only was the Greek achievement unrivaled in rapidity, variety, and quality of its cultural product, but it was remarkably successful 'in permeating and imposing its values upon alien civilizations.' (p. 1) It is the second aspect of the Greek achievement that Professor Hadas studies in the present work, and the period under study is for him clearly and absolutely a period of cultural fusion and diffusion. This period Dr. Hadas sees as especially important for later history and culture because it was the Hellenistic period which was to shape the course of later European culture.

By examining closely and carefully the interaction of Greek culture and alien civilizations, particularly Jewish, in such areas as language, customs, education, philosophy, religion, literary types, art, politics, historiography and other areas, Professor Hadas has not striven to give us a complete history of Hellenistic culture but rather an intensive study of certain pertinent areas of that culture, demonstrating that the Greeks had something powerful to offer the East in almost every case, a something

which was capable of fusion and diffusion because what the Greeks brought could be to some extent a 'recognition of earlier meetings of ancient cultures.' In contrast to those who would minimize the extent of the Hellenization of the East, Professor Hadas rightly maintains: 'When intercourse became general, cultural influences naturally moved in both directions, but hellenization of barbarians was more massive than barbarization of Hellenes. Even in the case of religious doctrine, where it is commonly held that the east was the donor and the west recipient, the movement was in fact a sort of oscillation, with the pendulum acquiring new color or force at either extreme. Repeatedly, and in matters which appear most characteristically eastern, we find that the initial impulses came from the west, and were then returned to the west with new significance or emphasis.' (p. 10) Professor Hadas' book is a powerful documentation of this thesis. This thesis is certainly not new nor particularly radical. Hadas, however, has given it new added strength through his close scrutiny of primary sources, particularly Jewish sources and classical sources, but also through selected evidence from other Eastern sources as well.

Nevertheless, there is much in Professor Hadas' book that will provoke discussion and even disagreement. Some, for example, will dispute that Plato's belief in the immortality of the soul was original with Plato and that it came into the Judæo-Christian tradition only by way of Plato's *Gorgias* (through iv Maccabees); that Thomas Aquinas is indebted to Posidonius for the doctrine of the authority of the will of God; that the Biblical tradition is the only legitimate formulation of the Augustan notion of the divine mission of Rome (the Hebrews are 'elect' people and so are the Romans); that there is a striking relationship between ideas in Livy's *History* and those contained in the historical books of the Old Testament. But to dismiss such statements peremptorily is to ignore Hadas' penetrating ability to discern important parallels and interactions, and what is more so, is to ignore distinct possibilities suggested by a close study of the primary sources.

Hellenistic Culture explodes the myth that Western European culture and civilization are the result of two separate and distinct parent civilization, the Hellenic-Roman and the Judæo-Christian, but rather shows cogently that Christianity did indeed derive from a Judaism that had already been Hellenized.

JOHN E. REXINE

A. A. M. VAN DER HEYDEN and H. H. SCULLARD (editors), *Atlas of the Classical World*. London: Nelson, 1959. Pp. 222, 73 maps and 475 illustrations. \$15.00.

This magnificent volume is much more than its title suggests: It is not only a geographical and historical Atlas of the Classical World; it is also a concise, scholarly, and lucid history of Greece and Rome from prehistoric times to the fifth century A.D., a history of their institutions and accomplishments, and a pictorial panorama of the lands, life, and works of art of the classical world. It is really 'a complete and har-

monious re-creation of the past' representing 'every aspect of our classical heritage' in a well-written text, in excellent, self-explanatory maps, and in superb photographs.

Besides the excellent geographical and historical maps there are numerous others presenting many new topics, thus offering in a comprehensive and pictorial way precious information both to the scholar and the general reader, especially because each map contains rich, precise and clearly printed comments. The illustrations give a most vivid picture of the ancient world in all its aspects: well-known works of art as well as smaller and rather unknown objects of everyday life, landscapes, ruins and reconstructions of ancient places, aerial views of famous sites of the ancient world, all provide a most illuminating, pleasant, and eloquent commentary to the text. The text itself 'deals systematically with the political, social, and cultural history of the classical world,' the similarities and differences of Greece and Rome, the reasons for their rise and decline, and the great heritage they left to humanity in literature, art, political institutions, and law.

All in all, this superb book is a masterful compendium of the classical world, an indispensable ancilla to every student of Greece and Rome, a rich and dependable encyclopedia of the history, life, and culture of the classical world. Therefore, the quotations from Thucydides and Horace that this book is really 'a possession for all times,' and 'a monument more lasting than bronze' are not an empty boast.

COSTAS M. PROUSSIS

ROBERT SPEAGHT, *Christian Theatre*. New York: Hawthorn Books, 1960.
Pp. 141. \$2.95.

This book, the 124th volume of *The Twentieth Century Encyclopedia of Catholicism*, is an attempt to provide a picture of the Christian theatre from the twelfth century up to now. But the picture given is limited and inadequate, not only because the book is too small for a complete examination of the vast theatrical production of almost 800 years, but particularly because by the word 'Christian' the author means 'Catholic Christian' only, thus precluding from his examination a great part of the non-Catholic Christian theatre of the period and—which is much more serious—conditioning his opinion about the merits or demerits of a dramatic work solely on its adherence to or its rejection of or its indifference to Catholicism. For, even when he happens to examine the work of some Protestant playwright, he looks at it with his Catholic prejudices: If he finds in it something resembling Catholicism, the work is automatically good and sound; otherwise, it is 'ludicrous' and a 'travesty' in the author's opinion! It is obvious that under these conditions and with such narrow criteria, not only the Christian theatre suffers from misrepresentations and misinterpretations, but also the art of theatre in general. The lack of an objective outlook and the use of extraneous criteria in the treatment of dramatic works impair the reliability of the book immensely.

For there is something good in it. The first chapter, at least, dealing with the Christian theatre of the Middle Ages, is informative and rather

detached from excessive religious sectarianism. It gives a good picture of the appearance, the first unsteady steps and the gradually full development of the medieval religious play. It first appeared as Liturgical Drama, which gave its place to the Miracle Plays, these to the Mysteries, and the latter to the Moralities, which 'were really a drama of ideas.' Along with the change of themes and character of the plays, their form also changed, as well as their administration and the way and facilities of their performances. Thus, for instance, the Latin language of the first plays was gradually substituted with the vernacular of each country; the performances moved from inside the church to its courtyard, to other outside places or to 'moving platforms' and pre-arranged locations; and from being exclusively the property of the clergy, the religious theatre gradually passed into the hands of the people through the actors' guilds.

Nevertheless, even in this chapter there are flagrant omissions, such as the omission of the Greek theatrical masterpiece of the Middle Ages, the Cretan play *The Sacrifice of Abraham*; and there are mistakes: for instance, on p. 33 Mr. Speaight writes: 'The story was to be found in the romance of Barlaam and Josaphat, ascribed to John of Damascus, who died in 1090.' But St. John of Damascus died more than three centuries earlier; he lived c. 675-749, and, in any case, he was dead before 754. But from the second chapter up to the end of the book, where the theatre from Reformation and Renaissance until today is examined, the omissions, misinformation and far-fetched interpretations become the rule of this unhappily prejudiced book. One must approach it with extreme caution and without great expectations.

COSTAS M. PROUSSIS

CYRUS H. GORDON, *New Horizons in Old Testament Literature*. Ventnor, New Jersey: Ventnor Publishers, 1960. Pp. 32.

The author of this booklet, Professor Cyrus H. Gordon of Brandeis University, is a well-known authority on the history, archaeology and literature of ancient Near Eastern peoples. The contents were first presented as two lectures at Christian Theological Seminary, Indianapolis, Indiana, in February 1960, and later appeared in *Encounter*.

The theme of the booklet is really fascinating and of great importance not only for the students of Old Testament but also for the students of comparative literature and history. In a pleasant, clear style and in a sincere, convincing manner, Professor Gordon speaks about the new horizons that have been now widely opened to the serious students of Old Testament on account of the new archaeological and philological discoveries and developments in the area of the Eastern Mediterranean. Thus, he advocates a new approach to Old Testament studies. He points out that it is high time now to place the Old Testament in the historical and cultural *milieu* not only of Palestine but of all the peoples and countries around the Eastern Mediterranean. And it is just this that he successfully tries to do here in a general way, even pointing sometimes to some specific instances. For the archaeological findings from the second millennium B.C. in this area, especially the deciphering and reading of the scripts

and languages of that period, have thrown a new and strong light upon the history of all the peoples of the area and have cleared our vision concerning their relations. Now it is evident that there existed interconnections, interrelations, mutual influence upon each of these peoples, particularly during the last half of the second millennium B.C.; that no people in the area was then isolated, but both financially and spiritually all peoples exchanged goods, ideas, modes of life, beliefs and cultures. Thus, Professor Gordon says, the Old Testament, especially its books dealing with the ancient Hebrew history, can be better understood and interpreted if put upon the solid historical foundations not only of the Jewish people but of the other Near Eastern peoples as well. Sometimes, for instance, what appeared up to yesterday as peculiarly Jewish is now proved to have been common to other neighboring peoples also. Moreover, the life and world described in the Homeric epic, in the Ugaritic epic, in the older historical books of Old Testament, and the life and world of other nearby peoples, are not alien to each other but very much similar in one way or another, as the deciphered documents and the comparative studies tend to assert today. Therefore, it is not only obsolete but even totally inadequate to limit the study of Old Testament—or, for that matter, the study of Homeric epic—to itself and to the people who created it. Only the comparative and simultaneous study of the history and culture of all peoples of the Eastern Mediterranean who then lived there as a large family—friendly or fighting each other, but nevertheless one family—only such a study, then, can give the necessary sound background for a full and correct understanding of the achievements of each and all of those peoples.

This new and important study of Professor Gordon's, coming after his similarly important books and articles in the last decade, lays the ground for further, eagerly awaited, advancement by him in the field of ancient Eastern studies.

COSTAS M. PROUSSIS

N. G. L. HAMMOND, *A History of Greece to 322 B.C.* Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1959. \$8.00.

This is a fine new history, which improves on all others of its scope in taking advantage of the very rapid changes which have taken place in our knowledge and evaluation of pre-historic Greece, and in a nice perception of the geography, based on a personal appraisal and resulting in many good maps and battle descriptions. The presentation is lively and clear; the assessment which Hammond gives is balanced and sane.

With so much that is good, it is a shame that more time and effort were not taken in the final editing of the book to make it more uniform and accurate. It is much too cluttered with unidentified names and places, neglects to date important events, and sorely needs many cross-references.

This is not a book for beginners, and yet the concession is made to the Greekless reader of using no Greek type. In spite of this, the reader will have to refer to Liddell-Scott-Jones *Greek-English Lexicon* in order to decipher the abbreviations used in referring to ancient sources. In this

respect the book falls between two stools, as its viewpoint is not consistent.

It is inevitable that Hammond's work will be compared with Bury-Meiggs *History of Greece*. Hammond is shorter, mainly because he curtails consideration of the western Greeks; and he is much livelier reading. He also includes summary chapters on Literature, Thought and Art, which are difficult topics to deal with in short compass, but are very well handled. The major difference, and a great improvement, lies in Hammond's careful and balanced handling of the new evidence which is available for the pre-historic period.

Certainly the blemishes in the execution of Hammond's plan in no way outweigh the book's essential virtues.

R. L. MURRAY, JR.

MEYER FORTES, *Oedipus and Job in West African Religion*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1959. Pp. 81. \$2.00.

This little book is an expansion of the Frazer Lecture for 1956 which was delivered by Professor Fortes at the University of Glasgow on the 28th of November 1957 under the title 'The Idea of Destiny in West African Religions.' It must be noted that the subject title could easily deceive the reader as to the scope of the book. The author does not deal with a variety of West African religions but takes only West African people as a characteristic example, the Tallensi, and with these as a case he makes a number of observations about their beliefs. Oedipus and Job are used in the most general, most loose, and for the classical and biblical scholar at least, most misleading way. Oedipus and Job for Meyer Fortes, who is William Wyse Professor of Social Anthropology in the University of Cambridge, are the Oedipal principle (the notion of Fate or Destiny) and the Jobian principle (Supernatural Justice).

In his analysis the reader will find nothing more than the most superficial resemblance between the Tallensi and Oedipus and Job. What professor Fortes gives an analysis of is the Tallensi belief in Prenatal Destiny or evil fate, the notion of *Yin* or Good Destiny, which grows out of ancestor spirit belief and demands unquestioning acknowledgment and submission. 'Submission to his ancestors is symbolic of his encapsulation in a social order which permits of no voluntary alteration of his status and social capacities. It is the common interest, the collective purposes that prevail.' (p. 67).

In the case of Job, Fortes argues, since Job's salvation comes when he recognized God's omnipotence as beyond human questioning, so the Tallensi would understand that their allegiance and submission, by analogy, would be and must be absolute toward their parents, actual and spiritual (*i.e.*, ancestors). The notion of evil Prenatal Destiny among the Tallensi indicates the 'fact of irremediable failure in the development of the individual to full social capacity. More than that, it gives symbolic expression to the implicit structural meaning of such failure as an indication of abortive filio-parental relationships.' (p. 76) In the case of Good Destiny we find successful individual development toward complete incorporation into society.

There is no distinction made in this book among terms, which the Greeks would call Moira (Moirai), Tyche, Daimonion, Theos. If one were to be strictly critical, these distinctions should be carefully made. Such subtleties do not seem to exist among the West Africans, or at least Professor Fortes doesn't tell us about them. Biblical scholars will not all accept the oversimplification of the Job situation, but it seems clear that the book is primarily aimed at sociologists, social anthropologists and ethnologists with some attempt to interest students of comparative religion.

JOHN E. REXINE

DAGOBERT D. RUNES, *Pictorial History of Philosophy*. New York: Philosophical Library, 1959. Pp. 406. Illustrated. \$15.00.

This is a truly magnificent publishing venture but the title of the book is highly misleading. Dagobert D. Runes has not presented us with a pictorial history of philosophy, nor even with a pictorial history of philosophers, in the generally accepted sense of the word. What we have here is a fascinating collection of nearly 1,000 portraits, facsimiles, photographs, archaeological illustrations and other pictorial material that would be of interest to anyone concerned with the history of human thought. A pictorial history of philosophy, it would seem upon reflection, is a contradiction in terms.

Dr. Runes' own definition of philosophy is both an extremely narrow and an extremely broad one:

'Philosophy is no more than man's orientation in the cosmos, and from this orientation stem the kindness, tolerance, and generosity which are the basis of all true teaching. Beyond this simple tasks of ethics there is nothing that falls in the realm of philosophy. Philosophy is ethics, or it is nothing at all.' (p. x)

This kind of specific yet broad definition of philosophy enables the author to include most of the world's important religious as well as philosophical thinkers and many others. Dr. Runes cannot see philosophy as valuable or useful except in terms of his own definition.

Thus we have chapters on 'Philosophy, Man, and Morals,' 'Judaism,' 'At the Cradle of Indian Thought,' 'The Philosophy of the Celestial People,' 'The Glory That Was Greece,' 'Greek Thought in Roman Lands,' 'The Beginning of Christianity,' 'The Dark Era of Knowledge,' 'The World of Islam,' 'Classics of France,' 'Two Spaniards,' 'The New Italy,' 'Great Men of Small Countries,' 'British Classics,' 'German Poets, Thinkers, Scientists,' 'Russia's Great Century,' and 'The Rise of the New World.'

If the reader expects to find any profound or detailed analysis of any of the thinkers included, he will be sadly disappointed. What he will find is the short kind of general article that is found in the smaller encyclopedias. The pictorial material, as the title suggests, is where the emphasis is laid and the text serves merely as a kind of necessary supplement to the pictures.

All in all, this book will excite young minds to a pictorial (and it is hoped, literary) investigation of some of the world's most important thinkers and will enrich the more mature and experienced reader's mind and imagination with pictorial representations of a particular kind that have here been collected in a single volume for the first time.

JOHN E. REXINE

DAGOBERT D. RUNES, *Concise Dictionary of Judaism*. Philosophical Library, 1959. Pp. 237. 64 plates. \$5.00.

This handy dictionary does not pretend to be exhaustive or encyclopedic but rather a concise reference book for the general reader of 'the meaning of the basic concepts germane to Judaism in its religious, historic and cultural aspects.' It presumes to be an up-to-date guidebook in the fields of Jewish history, religion, philosophy and literature. There is an attempt by the editor to emphasize those men of the past as well as of the present who are considered of primary significance for the contemporary reader.

Dr. Dagobert Runes, a former Director of the Institute for Advanced Education and a prolific writer and editor, has produced a dictionary of Judaism which will experience a good deal of use. It is only fair, however, to warn the reader who desires a quick and detailed coverage of Old Testament facts and figures that he will not always find them in this *Concise Dictionary of Judaism*. Though much Biblical material is included, a good deal is left out. The editor admits in his Preface that his choice of what to include and what not include has been determined by his own subjective judgment and his attempt to make the material relevant for a contemporary reader.

Nevertheless, the contemporary reader would have appreciated the inclusion of more Biblical material, particularly from the Hebrew perspective. This would have made this quite useful dictionary even more useful.

JOHN E. REXINE

G. L. HUXLEY, *Anthemius of Tralles: A Study in Later Greek Geometry*. (Greek, Roman and Byzantine Monographs, No. 1). Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1959. Paper. Pp. 62. \$1.75.

Anthemius of Tralles, the famous architect of the Church of Saint Sophia, was also a mathematician of note. The few fragments of his scientific treatises which have survived indicate that he contributed greatly to the flowering of creative mathematical thinking which occurred during the reign of Justinian the Great.

Mr. Huxley in this study does not discuss the architectural achievements of Anthemius, which have been well described in books on St. Sophia from Procopius onwards, but concentrates on Anthemius' contribution to ancient geometry, seeing him as one of the last great geometers

of antiquity' and 'a distinguished follower of the great Hellenistic geometers.'

Mr. Huxley presents a very readable English translation of Anthemius' treatise *Περὶ παραδόξων μηχανημάτων*, and of the *Fragmentum Mathematicum Bobiense* (which he attributes to Anthemius), accompanied by many notes and an extensive commentary. The translation was done from the critical edition of the Greek text by J. L. Herberg (*Mathematici Graeci Minores* [Copenhagen, 1927], pp. 71 ff.) which is fully reproduced at the end of Mr. Huxley's study. A description of the existing manuscripts of the first of the two translated treatises is also provided, but unfortunately it lacks the precision one would expect in such an undertaking today.

In separate chapters, the author discusses what the contemporary sources said about Anthemius (Procopius, Paul the Silentary, the Agathias), the reputation he enjoyed later both in Byzantium (Tzetzes) and among the Arab mathematicians, who did not hesitate to call him a peer of Archimedes in the study of mirrors. A chapter on Anthemius' influence on Western men of science such as the thirteenth-century Vitello concludes Mr. Huxley's study.

Mr. Huxley places Anthemius' death in A.D. 534. For this date he refers to the article on Anthemius in Pauly-Wissowa by F. Hultsch, who, on the basis of a misinterpreted passage in Agathias (v, 9), placed Anthemius' death 'um 534.' Cyril Mango and R. L. Van Nice of Dumbarton Oaks, who kindly called my attention to this error, are of the opinion that Anthemius must have died at a much later date; otherwise some of the most important architectural aspects of St. Sophia could not be credited to him.

Mr. Huxley's extremely useful study will surely be welcomed with enthusiasm by every student of Byzantine civilization, since Byzantine science has attracted far less attention than it deserves. Let us hope that he will continue his research in the field of Byzantine mathematics, which in the Palaeologean era witnessed so remarkable a flowering.

Finally one must not fail to congratulate the youthful quarterly, *Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies*, for inaugurating its monographic series so well.*

GEORGE C. SOULIS

DEMETRIOS N. MORAITES, 'Η ἀρχαιότερα γραπτὴ μορφὴ τῶν Λει-
τουργιῶν τοῦ M. Βασιλείου καὶ τοῦ Χονσοστόμου, *The Earliest
Known Form of the Liturgies of St. Basil the Great and St. John
Chrysostom*. Thessalonica: M. Stougiannaki-Papamarkou Press, 1957.
Pp. 38.

The stratum upon which the studies of our Liturgical life should be based is undoubtedly painstaking and accurate research in the area of the liturgical manuscripts and ancient liturgical texts. Thus Profesor Mora-

* Reprinted, with permission, from the January, 1960, issue of *Speculum*.

ites' edition of the earliest known form of the Liturgies of St. Basil and St. John Chrysostom is indeed gladly welcomed. Because for the first time these valuable texts become accessible both to the scholar and to the lay reader and for the first time are edited and annotated by a contemporary renowned Greek Orthodox scholar. Therefore, Professor Moraites has made a substantial step further after the publication of the existing liturgical manuscripts in the National Library of Athens during the thirties by Professor Trembelas. The present small but valuable volume is an edition of the most ancient existing Liturgical form of the two well-known liturgies which appear in the so-called Barberini codex. The date of this codex is fixed at the end of the eighth century. However, Professor Moraites aptly uses in the present edition the unedited manuscript Paris gr. 391. Its date may be fixed around the eleventh or the twelfth century. In reality it does not offer any point of important difference from the Barberini Codex. Professor Moraites in commenting on the text notes that the undisputed similarities of both Liturgies prove that their origin lies in an old common liturgical tradition, namely the Syriac liturgical tradition, which was the basis of the later developed liturgical forms. After a brief but pertinent discussion concerning the main points of similarities and differences, the author proceeds to the presentation of the original text. This is done with precision, critical annotation, and a careful evaluation of the problematic aspects of the textual material.

GEORGE S. BEBIS

HENRY BAMFORD PARKES, *Gods and Men: The Origins of Western Culture*. New York: Alfred Knopf, 1959. Pp. 489. \$7.50.

The present volume is a notable addition to the works in the field of history of civilization.

Dr. Parkes is an Englishman (Oxford B.A.) who came to the United States, did graduate work at the University of Michigan (Ph.D. 1929), and has been teaching in the field of history at New York University and other schools since 1930. During 1956-1957 he was a Fulbright professor at the University of Athens, Greece. Much of the book was actually written under the bright Greek skies.

The panoramic view of elements of ancient civilizations that have affected western culture, as presented by Dr. Parkes, will please the average Anglo-Saxon reader. His prose is effortless and possesses a flair usually absent from scholarly writings. His outlook is that of the contemporary 'common man' of letters. Unfortunately, it is too much so, in the reviewer's opinion.

This last point needs further elucidation. Though Dr. Parkes contends that he has no special theory of historical development to propound (he is against both Spengler and Toynbee), he does possess a strong bias: in fact he is an apostle of the sensate culture (to use Professor Sorokin's terminology) and also of a religious ethic that harmonizes with such sensate culture.

It is reassuring that the democratic Athenians are among his favorite heroes, but Plato, Socrates, and Aristotle are among his worst villains — especially Plato, whose influence the author denounces as the source of every corruption. He is not alone in this attitude toward the great philosopher; he seems to have borrowed heavily from Popper (*The Open Society and its Enemies*). Eastern Christianity is taken to task for allowing itself to fall under the influence of neo-Platonism. Latin Christianity fares better for 'preserving the essentials . . . the original Christian emphasis on Ethics . . .' (p. 425).

Despite such instances of Procrustean use of a crude yardstick in judging beliefs of other people and values of other periods, this reviewer recommends that the book be read for two reasons. First, the author seems to follow the latest scholarly findings in most non-controversial fields. Second, in areas in which the reader may disagree, he will find the book valuable because it reflects current viewpoints; and to refute incorrect doctrines one has to know them first.

DION JAMES J. ARCHON

JEROME CARCOPINO, *Daily Life in Ancient Rome*. Tr. by E. O. Larimer, ed. by H. T. Rowell. Eighth edition. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1958. Pp. xiii + 342.

This work is in many ways a classic in its field. The author claims that if the study of Roman life is not to become petrified in abstraction, it must be studied within a strictly defined period; such an approach is necessitated by the fact that human customs and life change very rapidly, and there is no common measure to judge different periods of human life, or ages so diversified as the history of the Roman Empire. Thus Carcopino, the eminent historian and archaeologist, confines his study to a generation most representative of Roman history and civilization — the period between the middle of the first century A.D. and the end of the year 138, when Roman power and prosperity reached their height. The author limits study to the life of the city of Rome, because there was such a gulf between city and country life that it is impossible to blend the two dissimilar pictures into one. Thus he prefers to present the life of the Roman capital.

His work falls into two parts. The first deals with the general subject 'The Physical and Moral Background of Roman Life,' while the second is inscribed 'The Day's Routine.' His numerous illustrations contribute immensely to the work, so that it is not a collection of abstract ideas or generalizations, but, on the contrary, a concise and comprehensive account.

He approaches the question of the population of Rome with care. He believes that the theories of Justus Lipsius on the one hand, and Dureau de la Malle's on the other, are two opposite extremes. His own thesis, based on the evidence of the *Regionaries* of the fourth century, is that in the second century Rome 'had 50,000 citizens bond or free, living in at least 1,000 *domus*, and a further population, which must have varied between 1,165,000 and 1,677,000 in its 46,602 *apartment blocks*.' But since such a study depends a great deal on imagination and hypotheses,

I wonder whether Carcopino's estimate is not hyperbolical. A population of 1,165,000 to 1,677,000 under such limited conditions as those of the city of Rome seems too large.

In any case, Carcopino believes that Rome's population during the reign of the Antonines approached that of our modern capitals. This population, however, suffered because of the limited circuit of the city. And the picture becomes even more obscure when we subtract the numerous zones of the public buildings, basilicas, baths, circuses, theaters and additional public buildings. Thus life in Rome could not have been very comfortable. People were forced to live in the humble *insula* while very few citizens could live in the rare *domus*. The over-population of Rome and the multiplicity of public buildings contributed to the congestion of the streets. Carcopino points out that according to calculations and measurements based on the census that was carried out by Vespasian and Titus, the Roman streets would cover approximately 89 kilometres if they were laid from end to end. In the same chapter, 'Houses and Streets,' the author indicates that the Roman streets formed 'an inextricably tangled net,' their disadvantages being 'aggravated by the vast height of the buildings which shut them in.' Thus the picture of the housing and the condition of the streets in Rome during the first and second centuries is not pretty.

In a much more interesting chapter, Carcopino discusses Roman society and its social classes; he includes in it four topics: 'Romans and Foreigners,' 'Slavery and Manumission,' 'The Confusion of Social Values,' and 'Living Standards and the Plutocracy.' While 'under the republic there had been equality for all citizens before the law, in the empire of the second and third centuries a legal distinction arose which divided the citizen body into two classes: the *honestiores* and the *humiliores*' (p. 52). Roman senators, knights, soldiers and veterans, men who held or had held municipal offices in cities outside of Rome and their families, belonged to the *first class*. The rest of the citizens belonged to the *Humiliores*. Once they were brought into public office or acquired wealth, citizens of the second class moved to the first. Again the author discusses the subdivisions of the main two classes and the qualifications required for one to ascend the social ladder, such as a certain amount of wealth. They all occupied a position similar to the stones of a pyramid on the top of which lay the *princeps*. Thus 'Rome appears a world petrified under a theocratic aristocracy,' although opportunity for circulation and equalitarian currents never ceased to exist.

Contrary to the traditional conception that slaves composed a mass of beings without rights, without personality, without guarantees, treated rather as brute beasts, Carcopino indicates that 'with few exceptions, slavery in Rome was neither eternal nor, while it lasted, intolerable.' This situation applies especially during the reign of Antonines. From the first century of the Empire the Romans treated their slaves more humanely. This humanitarian attitude culminated in the reign of Antoninus Pius, who condemned as homicide any slaying of a slave by the sole order of his master. Here the author narrates the human attitude towards slavery of such men as Pliny the Younger, and the senator Corellius Rufus. But this humane attitude towards slavery is further indicated by the fact that

of all the cities of antiquity, Rome alone redeemed her slaves by opening her door for their franchise. Thus 'at least 80 per cent of the population of Imperial Rome had been emancipated from more or less ancient servitude' (p. 61).

Living standards in Rome were not high. A great number of Romans directly or indirectly, 'at least one-third and possibly one-half,' lived on public charity. On the other hand there were a few thousand multimillionaires.

In his treatment of the topic 'Marriage, Woman, and the Family,' Carcopino points out that in the second century of our era relationship was now recognized through the female line too, and the unlimited power of the *pater familias* came to an end. 'The *pater familias* had been deprived of the right of life or death over his children which had been granted him by the twelve tables' and his authority over his wife was weakened. This was destined to alter the atmosphere of the Roman family with good results, *i.e.*, tenderness towards the children. But it had bad results too, such as complacency of the parents towards their children. And 'having given up the habit of controlling their children, they [the Romans] let the children govern them, and took pleasure in bleeding themselves white to gratify the expensive whims of their offspring.' Certainly this sounds like twentieth-century complacency.

Far removed from the picture during the days of the Republic, the Roman family presented all the symptoms of immorality and decline. In regard to the divorce rates, Carcopino says that in the Rome of the Antonines, Seneca's words were cruelly just: 'No woman need blush to break off her marriage, since the most illustrious ladies have adopted the practice of reckoning the year not by names of the consuls but by those of their husbands. They divorce in order to re-marry. They marry in order to divorce' (p. 100).

In his treatment of religion, the author relies on Cumont. He discusses the advent of Christianity. Though the Christians constituted a minority they had attracted the interest of the Romans since the days of Claudius. The simplicity and purity of the new religion, its emphasis on *agape*, the confidence of the Christians in their God, their love for each other, were great factors for the missionary activity of Christianity. The author relies here on the study of Duchesne and treats his subject sympathetically.

The nature of the information, the sometimes too scholarly treatment of certain subjects, the numerical and statistical data, make the reading of the book a little tiresome. Nevertheless, it is indispensable for the student of Classics, Roman history, or early Christianity. The volume is supplemented by the editor with a very valuable appendix dealing with ancient sources and modern works. The present edition by the Yale University Press is very beautiful indeed.

THE REV. DEMETRIOS J. CONSTANTELOS

BOOKS RECEIVED

JACQUES-ALBERT CUTTAT, *The Encounter of Religions: A dialogue between the West and the Orient*. New York, etc.: Desclée & Co., 1960.

IVAN SOFRANOV, *Histoire du Mouvement Bulgaire vers l'Eglise Catholique au XIX^e Siècle*. New York, etc.: Desclée & Co., 1960.

HERMANN DOERRIES, *Constantine and Religious Liberty*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1960.

GLANVILLE DOWNEY, *A History of Antioch in Syria*. Princeton: The University Press, 1961.

R. H. BLYTH, *Zen in English Literature and Oriental Classics*. New York: E. P. Dutton & Co., 1960.

JOHN H. CLOWER, JR., *The Church in the Thought of Jesus*. Richmond: John Knox Press, 1959.

MASSEY H. SHEPHERD, JR., *The Paschal Liturgy and the Apocalypse*. Richmond: John Knox Press, n.d.



Copyright and Use:

As an ATLAS user, you may print, download, or send articles for individual use according to fair use as defined by U.S. and international copyright law and as otherwise authorized under your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement.

No content may be copied or emailed to multiple sites or publicly posted without the copyright holder(s)' express written permission. Any use, decompiling, reproduction, or distribution of this journal in excess of fair use provisions may be a violation of copyright law.

This journal is made available to you through the ATLAS collection with permission from the copyright holder(s). The copyright holder for an entire issue of a journal typically is the journal owner, who also may own the copyright in each article. However, for certain articles, the author of the article may maintain the copyright in the article. Please contact the copyright holder(s) to request permission to use an article or specific work for any use not covered by the fair use provisions of the copyright laws or covered by your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement. For information regarding the copyright holder(s), please refer to the copyright information in the journal, if available, or contact ATLA to request contact information for the copyright holder(s).

About ATLAS:

The ATLA Serials (ATLAS®) collection contains electronic versions of previously published religion and theology journals reproduced with permission. The ATLAS collection is owned and managed by the American Theological Library Association (ATLA) and received initial funding from Lilly Endowment Inc.

The design and final form of this electronic document is the property of the American Theological Library Association.

brilliantly summarizes his own brilliant evaluation of a brilliant and unique civilization.

JOHN E. REXINE

FRANCIS DVORNIK, *The Idea of Apostolicity in Byzantium and the Legend of the Apostle Andrew. (Dumbarton Oaks Studies IV).* Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1958. Pp. 342. \$6.00.

This book by one of the world's leading Byzantinists, Professor Dvornik of Harvard's Dumbarton Oaks Research Library and Collection, is an exhaustive historical study of the idea of apostolicity in Byzantium and what Dvornik considers to be the legend of the Apostle Andrew in connection with Constantinople. This book was written in an attempt to clarify the Byzantine policy of adaptation of political administrative forms to ecclesiastical administrative forms and to show how the West in effect forced the East to adopt the argument of apostolicity as a counter claim to the West's demands for submission and primacy on the basis of St. Peter's apostolicity in Rome.

Father Dvornik's book is much too fully worked out to be fairly discussed in any great detail in such a brief review as this but some major points of the book should be noted. The story of the foundation of Constantinople by Andrew, Dvornik admits, could very well have originated at the end of the third or fourth century. However, though this was possible, on the basis of historical and philological evidence, there is no indication that it was so formulated at such an early date. No one in the Byzantine world saw the need for an argument from apostolic foundation for the ecclesiastical organization. It was not until the sixth and seventh centuries that the need was seen for such an argument on a major scale and the first codification of the legend of Andrew's founding of the see of Byzantium can be safely and conservatively dated toward the close of the seventh and the first half of the eighth centuries. This, of course, does not preclude the existence of an oral tradition or even of an earlier written tradition. Dvornik maintains that every condition for an Andrew tradition existed from the time of Constantius at the latest. This acceptance by both East and West was made plausible by the belief that Andrew preached the Christian Gospel in Scythia and Achaia and certainly Thrace and Byzantium appeared to be the obvious connections between his missionary work in these two regions.

Dvornik cogently demonstrates that the Byzantines were much longer influenced by the principles of adaptation of the political administrative forms of the Roman Empire to ecclesiastical organization than were the Westerners, that this was indeed a principle of the early Christian Church and not an unusual innovation. East and West were early developing in different directions, using different arguments at different times.

It was later that Rome tried to counter the claims of Constantinople to apostolic foundations, thus reversing her own previous position. In Dvornik's own concluding words:

"In reflecting on this change of attitude on the part of the West toward Byzantine claims regarding the apostolic character of the *see* of Constantinople, it is a great temptation to conclude these considerations with the remark: *Difficile est saturam non scribere*. There is, however, nothing satirical in the history of this dispute. From beginning to end this argument over two principles of ecclesiastical organization — that of apostolicity and that of adaptation to the political organization of the Empire — was conducted earnestly and passionately. The lack of understanding of the first and the overemphasizing of the second on the part of the Byzantines induced the Romans to deny to Constantinople that second rank in Church organization which it rightfully claimed. Similarly, Rome was prevented from recognizing early enough the change in Byzantium that favored the apostolic principle in Church organization. Thus it was that this dispute contributed so considerably toward intensifying the misunderstanding between West and East; a misunderstanding that, together with other factors, led to the schism so fateful for the history of Christianity." (pp. 298-299)

This study of the role of the importance of apostolicity in East-West relations is a major contribution to historical and theological scholarship. The twenty-six page bibliography at the end of this volume adds to the extreme usefulness of this very important book.

JOHN E. REXINE

HANS VON CAMPENHAUSEN, *The Fathers of the Greek Church*.
Translated by Stanley Godman. New York: Pantheon Books, 1959.
Pp. 170. \$3.95.

There has been a crying need for a general book on the Greek Church Fathers uncluttered by ponderous notes and scholarly jargon but one which would give the English reader an opportunity to get a



Copyright and Use:

As an ATLAS user, you may print, download, or send articles for individual use according to fair use as defined by U.S. and international copyright law and as otherwise authorized under your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement.

No content may be copied or emailed to multiple sites or publicly posted without the copyright holder(s)' express written permission. Any use, decompiling, reproduction, or distribution of this journal in excess of fair use provisions may be a violation of copyright law.

This journal is made available to you through the ATLAS collection with permission from the copyright holder(s). The copyright holder for an entire issue of a journal typically is the journal owner, who also may own the copyright in each article. However, for certain articles, the author of the article may maintain the copyright in the article. Please contact the copyright holder(s) to request permission to use an article or specific work for any use not covered by the fair use provisions of the copyright laws or covered by your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement. For information regarding the copyright holder(s), please refer to the copyright information in the journal, if available, or contact ATLA to request contact information for the copyright holder(s).

About ATLAS:

The ATLA Serials (ATLAS®) collection contains electronic versions of previously published religion and theology journals reproduced with permission. The ATLAS collection is owned and managed by the American Theological Library Association (ATLA) and received initial funding from Lilly Endowment Inc.

The design and final form of this electronic document is the property of the American Theological Library Association.

PAUL AUVRAY PIERRE POULAIN, and ALBERT BRAISE, *Sacred Languages*. Translated from the French by J. Tester. New York: Hawthorn Books, 1960. Pp. 173.

This book is the 116th volume of a 150 volume series of the *Twentieth Century Encyclopedia of Catholicism*, a vast Catholic publishing project edited by Henri Daniel-Rops of the French Academy. Each volume is a complete and independent study of a given religious subject — the subjects being assembled into fifteen sections ranging from Knowledge and Faith to the non-Christian beliefs. These editions, "international in scope, comprehensive in concept," are written by competent Catholic scholars and aim at "conveying religious culture . . . which should bring Catholics much spiritual joy," writes *L'Osservatore Romano*. They are, then, Catholic in spirit and purpose.

This small volume, however, is more or less objective and does not contain any obvious Catholic propaganda. It is written by three French scholars and translated by J. Tester. Mr. Auvray deals with the Hebrew and Aramaic languages, Professor Poulain with the Greek, and Professor Blaise with Latin. These treatises do not exhaust their themes, yet they are useful introductions to the respective languages.

Because of the threefold authorship, the book lacks the necessary uniformity of style and workmanship: The authors treat their parts differently, each emphasizing more or less this or that aspect of the respective language. Mr. Auvray, for instance, devotes a long part of his study to the script, grammar, structure, and syntax of Hebrew and Aramaic, while both Professors Poulain and Blaise do not give much or any space to these aspects of Greek and Latin. In dealing with Greek as a sacred language, Professor Poulain examines the *Koinê* from the historical point of view, particularly as it appears in the Bible, and as a precise instrument for the statement of the Christian doctrines. Finally, Professor Blaise's essay on Latin is an examination of Christian Latin literature and language, liturgical Latin, and the vocabulary and style of ecclesiastical Latin.

But if there is no uniformity in themes and workmanship, there is one unifying idea throughout the three separate parts: the belief that all three (four with the Aramaic) languages were the most appropriate vehicles of expressing and conveying the revealed Divine truth. Even where they seem inadequate in clarity and precision, a closer examination may show that the "inadequacy" lies with us rather than with the languages themselves, or it is the product of faulty textual tradition or mistranslation due to the different spirit and structure of each lan-

guage. The latter is very much evident in the Septuagint, for instance. From this attestation the conclusion comes naturally that a good knowledge of the sacred languages is indispensable for any theologian or priest — a suggestion which also pervades the entire book.

All the parts of this book throw ample light on many of the linguistic problems which vex any student of the Bible. The first part gives the rudiments of the Hebrew language, its peculiarities in grammar, structure, and spirit, peculiarities which explain much of the difficulty one encounters when reading the Greek, Latin, or any other translation of the Old Testament. For instance, the scarcity of abstract thought in the ancient Semites accounts for the scarcity of abstract nouns among the Hebrews and other Semitic peoples, in contrast to the abundance of abstract thought and nouns in Greek and Latin. The same is true for the scarcity of adjectives and adverbs, moods and tenses, for the consonantal character of the Hebrew script, and for other peculiarities of the Hebrew language, which make extremely difficult its rendition into languages different in spirit and grammar, such as Greek and Latin. Thus, one should be on the alert when meeting some "contorted" and "un-Hellenic" expressions in the Septuagint. But if one is able to resort to the original Hebrew Bible, one may easily overcome many of these difficulties.

The part on the Greek language starts with the following statement: "It was the providential good fortune of Christianity to have been able to express the Word of God in a language understood by the whole of the then civilized world, just as it was the good fortune of the first Christian missionaries to have been able to travel freely throughout a world where except for local disturbances the *pax Romana* ruled, the Roman peace." (p. 75) The author proceeds, then, to show how the Greek language and culture entered Rome and almost Hellenized the Roman Empire, thus giving birth to the Greek *Koinê*, which became the *lingua franca* of the then known world and the vehicle of Christian teaching and thought everywhere. Greek was the language of the Christian Church not only in the East but even in the West, and "it was not before the middle of the third century that the Church of Rome adopted Latin in its liturgy," Professor Poulain writes (p. 78). In contrast to the usual accusation that *Koinê* was a poor language and a corrupter form of Ancient Greek, Professor Poulain does not spare praises for the richness and expressiveness of the language of New Testament and the Fathers of the Church. He proposes, for instance, "to mark some of the characteristics which make it such a superb instrument for the expression of the finest shades of meaning"

(p. 79). Later on, on page 83, he quotes with approval the following statement of R. Rothe: "We can indeed with good right speak of a language of the Holy Ghost. For in the Bible it is manifest to our eyes how the Divine Spirit at work in revelation always takes the language of the particular people chosen to be the recipient and makes of it a characteristic religious variety by transforming existing linguistic elements and existing conceptions into a shape peculiarly appropriate to that Spirit. This process is shown most clearly by the Greek of the New Testament." And further below on page 96: "A spiritual revolution as profound as the birth of Christianity could not but betray itself in a new kind of language," that is, in the Greek *Koinē*. Pointing out the *Koinē*'s philological and theological importance, especially its preciseness in stating the Christian doctrine through the Greek Fathers of the Church, Professor Poulain concludes: "On the other hand, we may wonder whether they (*i.e.*, the Greek Fathers of the Church) did not contribute to Hellenism much more than they borrowed from it. . . . The early Christian theologians, measuring against the standard of the revelation of the Logos the partial truths which they found in pagan thought, ensured what could not perhaps have been expected without them, the survival, and later the renaissance, of Greek thought." (p. 117)

I have quoted rather extensively — though not all the points I wanted to — from Professor Poulain's treatise, only to point out to those clamoring in this country about changing the language of Greek Orthodox Church, what a catastrophe they are advocating for Greek Orthodoxy. On the contrary, great and sustained efforts must be made by the Orthodox theologians and clergy to acquaint themselves fully with the Biblical Greek, to study it thoroughly, and to undertake scholarly research into all its facets. If non-Greek and non-Orthodox theologians and clergymen deem it necessary for themselves to grasp fully Biblical Greek, how much more is this incumbent on the Greek Orthodox?

In that concern, very illuminating is Professor Blaise's treatment of Christian Latin. Though Latin has not the same great tradition and expressive power of Greek, yet, on the one hand, it is tenaciously preserved as the official language of Roman Catholicism, and on the other, it is the subject of innumerable detailed studies, general and particular. Of course, even in the Roman Catholic Church there is a tendency, unsuccessful up to now, to substitute for Latin the various vernaculars of the different countries where Roman Catholicism exists today. But Professor Blaise writes: "Would not the liturgy lose its sacred character if the services and prayers of the Church were in a

familiar and everyday language? Whatever the answer, if there is still a living Christian Latin, it is that of the liturgy: the mother tongue which in its prayers and hymns cradled our infancy in the faith, a living language, not in the ordinary and material sense that it produces new works and creates new words, but spiritually, in our hearts, able more than any other Latin to move the spirits of those who hear it." (p. 143) Also, Professor Blaise is complaining that the knowledge and study of Christian Latin is lessening, and he vividly urges that it must be intensified, especially by the Roman Catholic clergy. It is much more important for them, he suggests, even to devote less time and energy to classical Latin and much more to Christian Latin so that they may perform their mission better.

Professor Blaise's study is, in parts, very detailed concerning Latin vocabulary and style, but also shows, almost in every page, among other things, the great influence that Greek has exerted on the formation of Christian Latin. In this concern one may justly say that this kind of detailed philological research is a major *desideratum* for the Greek Christian language also, not only the *Koinē*, but the liturgical Greek as well. Of course, extensive work has already been done, but for the New Testament Greek only and mostly by foreign scholars. Yet, this is a work most appropriate for Greek Orthodox scholars, for many and evident reasons. And this study of the Greek Christian language should be widened and deepened so that it may embrace even specific themes, such as the history of words, metaphors, symbolic expressions, stylistic forms, and the standardization or the evolution of their meaning and use in the long life of the Greek Christian language. Such an extensive and detailed study will help for a better understanding not simply of the text but first of all of the living spirit of the Scriptures and of the other sacred literature.

COSTAS M. PROUSSIS

YVES CONGAR, O. P., *After Nine Hundred Years: The Background of the Schism Between the Eastern and Western Churches*. New York: Fordham University Press, 1959. Pp. ix, 150. \$4.50.

The announcement by Pope John XXIII on January 25, 1959, of the impending Ecumenical Council which would be "an invitation to the separated Christian Communities to find unity," prompted the Russian Center of Fordham University under Father Paul Malleux, S. J.,



Copyright and Use:

As an ATLAS user, you may print, download, or send articles for individual use according to fair use as defined by U.S. and international copyright law and as otherwise authorized under your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement.

No content may be copied or emailed to multiple sites or publicly posted without the copyright holder(s)' express written permission. Any use, decompiling, reproduction, or distribution of this journal in excess of fair use provisions may be a violation of copyright law.

This journal is made available to you through the ATLAS collection with permission from the copyright holder(s). The copyright holder for an entire issue of a journal typically is the journal owner, who also may own the copyright in each article. However, for certain articles, the author of the article may maintain the copyright in the article. Please contact the copyright holder(s) to request permission to use an article or specific work for any use not covered by the fair use provisions of the copyright laws or covered by your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement. For information regarding the copyright holder(s), please refer to the copyright information in the journal, if available, or contact ATLA to request contact information for the copyright holder(s).

About ATLAS:

The ATLA Serials (ATLAS®) collection contains electronic versions of previously published religion and theology journals reproduced with permission. The ATLAS collection is owned and managed by the American Theological Library Association (ATLA) and received initial funding from Lilly Endowment Inc.

The design and final form of this electronic document is the property of the American Theological Library Association.

and enjoyed by itself as a good English literary text. And this is not a small feat. All in all, this excellent edition is a scholarly, trustworthy, and valuable work.

COSTAS M. PROUSSIS

DONALD C. SWANSON, with the assistance of SOPHIA P. DJAFERIS, *Vocabulary of Modern Spoken Greek (English-Greek and Greek-English)*. Minneapolis: The University of Minnesota Press, 1959. Pp. 408. \$5.00.

This long-awaited and much needed book will immensely help English-speaking people to understand and learn Modern Greek in its spoken form; vice versa, it will also help the Greeks in their learning of spoken English.

After the Preface (pp. 3-8), where Mr. Swanson explains the scope and principles of his book, there follows a rather sizable Introduction (pp. 9-62), in which he presents the external history of the Greek language, the transition from Ancient to Modern Greek, the structure of Modern Greek, and its orthography and pronunciation. There follows the English-Greek Vocabulary (pp. 67-260), which contains about 3750 entries, and then the Greek-English Vocabulary (pp. 263-392) with about 4550 entries. Six small Appendices (pp. 393-408), dealing briefly with some names, weights and measures, food and drink, greetings, abbreviations, addenda and corrigenda, complete the book.

This is the first work of its kind in the English language, and for this reason very important and useful, even though it is not complete or perfect. Mr. Swanson himself confesses: "A really complete dictionary of this type would include, I estimate, about 10,000 English entries, and between 20 and 30 thousand Greek entries," (p. 4) And of course, errors, shortcomings (in the history and structure of the language, and especially in the translation of words and expressions), and misprints, are not infrequent — though they are much fewer than one might expect from a pioneering work, which had no similar works in English as precedents to call upon them for reference and assistance, for better or for worse. Perhaps only the *Grammar of Modern Greek* by Julian T. Pring (first edition in 1950) was composed with the same spirit and perspective. Three similar works in German and French that I happen to know (one by Mitsotakis in German, and two in French,

one by Pernot and the other by Missir), are not even as good or practical. Mr. Swanson has chosen to collect only the basic vocabulary of Modern spoken Greek and many and frequently used idiomatic expressions from everyday life, and tried to render them into the analogous everyday vocabulary and idiomatic expressions of English. And he has achieved a pronounced success in this endeavor. With this small precious work he offers a first rate assistance to those visiting Greece and desiring to understand, learn, and speak the living language of the Greek people.

The shortcomings and inadvertencies referred to above cannot be adequately treated here, for, though minor, they are numerous and need a detailed registration and examination — a treatment which is not in keeping with the character of this periodical. However, these mistakes do not subtract much from the great usefulness of the work; besides, they may be easily corrected in a second edition.

One wishes that Mr. Swanson may soon be able to extend his *Vocabulary* so that it may include all the Greek and English entries the author deems necessary for a complete dictionary of Modern spoken Greek. And furthermore, one wishes heartily for the compilation and publication of a good and complete Greek-English dictionary of Modern Greek in its literary form, so that the translators of Modern Greek literature may have a competent and trustworthy aid in their difficult task. Such a dictionary will greatly enhance the translation of modern Greek literary works into English, thus making possible a full acquaintance of the worthy modern Greek culture outside the Greek boundaries. It is something needed as much as this small but very important and helpful work of Mr. Swanson.

COSTAS M. PROUSSIS

VASIL T. ISTAVRIDIS, 'H Ἀλεξανδρινὴ Σχολὴ μετὰ τὸν Ὁριγένη (The Alexandrian School after Origen). Istanbul: Patriarchal Press, 1959. Pp. 93.

The present study by Dr. Vasil Istavridis, professor of Ecumenics at the Patriarchal Theological School of Halki, Constantinople, is a continuation of his dissertation, *Theological Education in the Alexandrian School*,* which he presented to the Faculty of the School of

* Subsequently published in Greek by the Patriarchal Press, 1956, and reviewed in Vol. II, No. 2, 1956, pp. 100-102, of this journal.



Copyright and Use:

As an ATLAS user, you may print, download, or send articles for individual use according to fair use as defined by U.S. and international copyright law and as otherwise authorized under your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement.

No content may be copied or emailed to multiple sites or publicly posted without the copyright holder(s)' express written permission. Any use, decompiling, reproduction, or distribution of this journal in excess of fair use provisions may be a violation of copyright law.

This journal is made available to you through the ATLAS collection with permission from the copyright holder(s). The copyright holder for an entire issue of a journal typically is the journal owner, who also may own the copyright in each article. However, for certain articles, the author of the article may maintain the copyright in the article. Please contact the copyright holder(s) to request permission to use an article or specific work for any use not covered by the fair use provisions of the copyright laws or covered by your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement. For information regarding the copyright holder(s), please refer to the copyright information in the journal, if available, or contact ATLA to request contact information for the copyright holder(s).

About ATLAS:

The ATLA Serials (ATLAS®) collection contains electronic versions of previously published religion and theology journals reproduced with permission. The ATLAS collection is owned and managed by the American Theological Library Association (ATLA) and received initial funding from Lilly Endowment Inc.

The design and final form of this electronic document is the property of the American Theological Library Association.